OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO. ED 041 186

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

CH ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE
AA 000 594	95	Aug 70	RIEDEC70

AUTHOR
Bailey, Stephen K.

TITLE
Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools. Final Report.

SOURCE CODE QPX85197
INSTITUTION (SOURCE) Syracuse Univ., N.Y. Research Corp.

SP. AG. CODE RMQ66000
SPONSORING AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

EDRS PRICE 0.75;7.40
CONTRACT NO. OEC-0-70-3444 (508)
GRANT NO.

REPORT NO.
BUREAU NO.

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
146p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Secondary Schools; Public Schools; Urban Areas; *Racism; *Demonstrations (Civil); Civil Disobedience; *Student Activism; *Community Surveys; Ethnic Groups; Student Participation; Socioeconomic Influences

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

In the Spring of 1970, the Policy Institute of the Syracuse University Research Corporation was "asked to investigate the causes of violent unrest and educational disruption in a fair sample of the nation's urban high schools, and to identify strategies that appeared to be successful in mitigating the worst of the troubles." This report is the result of an in-depth analysis conducted by the Policy Institute staff. The data collected involved approximately 60,000 students from 27 public secondary schools selected within 19 large cities. Interviews were also conducted with administrators, teachers, parents, community people, police and district officials. Questionnaires were completed from secondary schools in the United States that met certain criteria. A copy of the questionnaire, statistical tables, bibliographies, summarization of findings and recommendations for policy-making are included in this final report. (LS)

ED 041 186

UD

Syracuse University Research Corporation, Merrill Lane, University Heights, Syracuse, New York 13210

Disruption in Urban Public Secondary Schools

Final Report
OEC-0-70-3444(508)

August 1970

SURC

AA 000 594

SURC Policy Institute

Letter of Transmittal

August 5, 1970

Bureau of Research
United States Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen:

We are pleased to submit our final report on disruption in public secondary schools in the United States under contract OEC-0-70-3444(508).

Stephen K. Bailey
Chairman

Syracuse University Research Corporation, Merrill Lane, University Heights, Syracuse, New York 13210 tel: 315-477-8688

DISRUPTION IN URBAN PUBLIC
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Published by the Syracuse University Research Corporation under support of the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The findings and judgments expressed herein do not necessarily reflect any position or policy of the Office of Education and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

Annotated Table of Contents

pages 7-13

PREFACE

This is an unsettling story of an unsettling reality. It is a story of aggravated assault upon the rules and decorum of America's urban public high schools. It is an often unpleasant story as all stories must be where leading themes are fear, prejudice, poverty, arrogance, insensitivity, and brutality. It is a continuing story. For its basic plot is created and recreated daily in the pathologies of current urban tensions. Furthermore, many of the cures for perceived troubles are ineffable except in terms of the moral regeneration of an entire nation -- an unlikely possibility.

But it is easy to lament the human condition including man's propensity for perjured helplessness. It is also easy to conjure and to style quick and simple solutions to complex problems. Neither literary posture is appropriate to the task assigned to the Policy Institute of the Syracuse University Research Corporation by the United States Office of Education. In the Spring of 1970, we were asked to investigate the causes of violent unrest and educational disruption in a fair sample of the nation's urban high schools, and to identify strategies that appeared to be successful in mitigating the worst of the troubles. This request stemmed from an accumulation of evidence in the hands of the U. S. Commissioner of Education to the effect that recent deportment in an increasing number of urban high schools had deteriorated to a point where the educative capacity of the high schools was seriously if not mortally, threatened. And the turbulence seemed to be spreading.

The job assigned to the staff of the Policy Institute was to learn enough through reading, interviews, direct observation, and survey research to be able to describe the phenomena and the problems accurately and then to suggest therapies whose validation had been tested clinically by responsible actions in existing urban settings.

Our findings on these matters constitute this report.

A few notes on matters of definition and method. We found early that there was no simple way of determining the contours and parameters of the word "disruption." There is a wider word, "unrest," even more difficult to define but probably more commonly used. It was our judgment from a thorough review of the literature and from informal discussions with schoolmen in the Syracuse, New York area that, in spite of the strictures, we would have to pin-point particular behavior as disruptive and try to avoid the mushiness of the word "unrest." One comment by a high school principal in the San Francisco Bay Area graphically illustrates the point: "Which do you want to talk about? Unrest or Disruption? We have a lot of unrest here which shows that we are doing a good job."

We finally agreed that a school disruption is any event which significantly interrupts the education of students. Most common among these would be student boycotts, walkouts, or strikes; teacher boycotts, walkouts or strikes; property damage including arson and vandalism; rioting and fighting; physical confrontations between students and staff; picketing and unauthorized parading; the presence on campus of unruly, unauthorized, non-school persons; and lastly, that catch-all phrase -- abnormal unruliness among students.

As far as research method is concerned, the first period of the project was spent collecting and analyzing useful current literature. Some of the best items on high school disruption came from Dr. Mark Chesler of the University of Michigan's Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge which has considerable experience in developing knowledge and wisdom about the subject. We have included in appendix B an annotated bibliography of selected references. In no sense is this list comprehensive. It is designed to introduce anyone interested in this problem to literature we consider particularly helpful. It is noteworthy that there has been, to date, very little treatment of the matter in the scholarly journals. Much of the best work appears in the more popular media.

Of the staff of seven working on this project, one half-time graduate student was assigned as librarian and was responsible for collecting, collating, and analyzing incoming literature and, later, incoming site-visit reports.

Reading was supplemented by field work. The Policy Institute staff selected 19 large cities in the United States to visit. Two criteria were paramount: first, that all sections of the country would be represented; and second, and in our view more important because of the sensitivity of this subject among schoolmen, that some member of the field staff would already have had personal contact with relevant actors in selected cities and particular schools. (See appendix C for list of cities.) In other words, the Policy Institute's concern with access to complete and honest information in the field was deemed extremely important. It is not a negative criticism of people in the secondary school community to note that, for the most part, they are not naturally eager to discuss their most serious problems with total strangers.

This reluctance is also true of center city students as reflected in a common question to our field people, "Who are you? Some kind of cop?"

All the schools visited were public institutions. Our quick review of the news media in the early Spring of 1970 indicated almost no reported disruptions in private urban secondary schools, a phenomena which might suggest further research and a further report.

Finally, we were clear in our own minds that when we did field work on a "school", we should include all direct parties to an institution's existence and maintenance -- parents, teachers, administrators, system officials, students, community organizations that pay attention to the schools, other community opinion-formers, the local press, police officials, and even those such as cab drivers in school neighborhoods or businessmen with particular interests in the fortunes of the schools.

Summary logistical data on the field-work phase are as follows:

Time span -- March 12 - June 30, 1970.
Number of cities visited -- 19.
Number of secondary schools visited -- 27.
Approximate number of students in these 27 schools -- 60,000.
Field research staff -- 5 plus two occasional consultants.

The raw site-visit reports indicate that the staff discussed disruption either alone or in small groups with the following numbers of persons related to the 27 schools:

95	administrators.
155	teachers.
300	students.
82	parents.
55	community people.
30	police.
40	school district officials.
32	"others".

The raw site-visit reports are not included with this document because they contain a great deal of information developed after a clear commitment of anonymity to the informer on the part of the interviewer. On the other hand, in the pages which follow, we have folded in illustrations and examples from the 27 schools to further amplify the points we make.

Additional inputs into the research include notes and reports from important conferences such as the gathering of parents, students, teachers, principals, and related people from six Brooklyn, New York high schools, all of which had been disrupted. That particular meeting, held on March 8 and 9, 1970, was called by the Brooklyn representative on the New York Board of Education at a retreat in Tuxedo, New York.

In addition to reading, site-visit interviews and observations, and conferences, the Policy Institute staff felt it wise to provide through survey research a systematic referent against which to consider, and by means of which to enrich further, the raw data acquired on site-visits. With the assistance of the Institute for Community Psychology at Syracuse University, a questionnaire was sent to all public secondary schools in the United States, that met the following criteria: first, the reported enrollment had to be 750 students or more; and second, the school's post office address, according to the National Association of Secondary School Principals, had to be a city or other less-than-county political jurisdiction of at least 50,000 persons. We are aware that there is a certain frayed edge to a list of this kind. For example, a high school such as Park Rose just outside Portland, Oregon, has a Portland label address in the files of the NASSP.

We consider this a minor weakness. 2,000 questionnaires were sent out, the vast majority to central city secondary schools, an unidentifiable few to "suburban" schools, and none to rural institutions.

683 have been executed and returned in time for analysis and inclusion in this report. In view of the fact that delays over which the Policy Institute had no control precluded the mailing of the questionnaire until after school was out in late June 1970, we consider 35% a respectable respondent rate under the circumstances.

The questionnaire (see appendix E) contained 106 multiple-choice items and was designed to be accomplished by a principal in approximately 30 minutes. As the reader of appendix E can see, the survey generates factual information about disruptive events in hundreds of secondary schools, a systematic understanding of the kinds of strategies used to cope with those events, and a range of principals' views on a series of propositions relating to secondary school disruption.

In making this report we are especially indebted to hundreds of American citizens, inside and outside of school buildings, who gave our staff unusual amounts of time and consideration. Most fully realized that disruption threatened the very education of the young, a phenomenon which no viable society could withstand for long. They rose to that challenge and were candid, thoughtful, and constructive. We owe them much.

Responsibility for all errors of fact and judgment are assumed by the Policy Institute of the Syracuse University Research Corporation.

Stephen K. Bailey

Syracuse, New York
August 1, 1970

PART I

ANNOTATED TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

Page

An introduction to the problem. Mandate from the U. S. Office of Education. Defining the word, "disruption". Research methods, including literary, field phase, and questionnaire features. Plaudits and acknowledgments to those who contributed.. 1

PART II

SIZE AND NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

A brief description of three recent polls which portray disruption of secondary schools. Difficulties in making comparisons among them due to different definitions and different samples. The Syracuse questionnaire and results showing types and incidence of disruption nationally and by each of the eight regions used by the Office of Education to collect less-than-national data. Some prime conclusions from the Syracuse survey highlighted by the fact that, during the last three years, 85% of all responding urban high schools had experienced one or more kinds of disruption as defined by the Policy Institute............................ 14

PART III

CAUSES

Introduction--the complicated social chemistry of which a high school is only a part. Two equal absurdities: that "only outside forces and problems create disorder," and that the schools are solely responsible for all difficulties.

Page

Hence the division of Part III into societal causes and in-school causes 22

A. SOCIETAL CAUSES

1. Violence in America. A reference to its long history, its continual presence both at home and abroad, and the dire warnings of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. The special effect of television on the problem and the disproportionate incidence among the young, urban poor 22

2. The Success of the Civil Rights Protests. The prime features of these protests are that (1) they represent a direct assault on legitimate authority and were judged morally correct by most of the nation, and, (2) they worked. Laws and practices were changed largely because of disruption 24

3. Visibility and Apparent Success of College Protests. The ripple effect of much publicized disruption on numerous college and university campuses which creates a climate of legitimate protest in educational institutions. Once again, the message to the adolescent high school youth is that disruption works 24

4. The Expression of Ethnic/Racial Pride. A reference to the historic role of public schools as middle class instruments which certified for the young what is right and what is wrong in American society. The sudden demise of this certifying role as pungent expressions of racial and ethnic pride arise from the country's most oppressed minorities. The particular and volatile effect this would naturally have on adolescents. A suggestion that this issue will not soon abate. As the American society opens further, both vertically, and in its tolerance for differing standards and mores, the level and complexity of demands made on public high schools will continue to rise sharply 25

5. Participatory Democracy. The thrust in low income neighborhoods, reflected in government policies such as the community action program of OEO or model cities, for wide and meaningful participation by local residents and clients in the formation and administration of public programs.

Page

The effect of this on high school students who come from such neighborhoods. The difficulties of operating meaningful participatory democracy are discussed as well as its potentially profitable results in the high schools....... 26

6. Slum Life Styles. A discussion of the unsettling disorderliness of the American slum and the problems young people from such neighborhoods bring to the high schools. The failure of most well-off Americans to comprehend the depth of ghetto squalor and filth. The question is raised as to whether the historic role of the school as a way-out or a great equalizer is really true and to what extent slum youth understand that question. The difficulties of educating such young people in "gratification postponement"...................................... 28

7. Black Revenge. The unpleasantness of the subject but the need to describe it for its high relevance to the subject of disruption. White fears and white reactions...... 30

8. Racism--Black and White. A reference to the two-society message in the Kerner Commission Report and a brief description of the number one cause, according to the Commission: white racism. Further discussion of racism in the schools and a suggestion that some practices in counselor's offices, on athletic fields, or in connection with other activities, while not racially based, seem so to many minority students. Black racism in the form of an arrogant disdain for the white society..... 31

9. The Television Generation. The fact that this is the first society in history to see daily the grotesqueness of its blemishes is pointed out. The old innocence of the adolescent is wiped out. Television graphically tells the young that the discrepancy between the nation's claims and its actual practices is wide indeed. Thus, even more mistrust. And television sharply reduces the fraction of education that goes on inside school buildings... 32

10. "Situation Ethics" and the New Permissiveness. A discussion of the relaxation of old restrictions and taboos in this country since World War II; the fact that schools are natural arenas for clashes between diverging old and

Page

new cultures. The schools are caught in the middle; the students are hardly the only public with which they must deal. The new permissiveness has contributed to a philosophy of temporary and short-range ethics. Especially in political matters, students find it ever more difficult to say what is right and what is wrong...................... 33

B. IN-SCHOOL CAUSES

Introduction--A further emphasis on the fact that the causes of high school disruption run on a circular continuum from the wider society, on through the schools, and back to the wider society. In-school causes of disruption are real but they are exacerbated by a variety of societal phenomena described earlier........................ 35

1. Student Involvement in Policy. A discussion of the healthy debate in every school as to the relative weight to give student views in matters of school practices and policies -- especially in social codes, including dress and grooming regulations. There is also a rapidly growing interest in participation in curriculum decisions where matters are much more complicated...................... 36

2. Facilities. For persons not accustomed to visiting large urban public high schools, the effect can be startling. Overcrowding, physical arrangements which contribute to disruption, and similar matters are discussed.. 37

3. Restrictions on Behavior. Note is taken of the constant contention produced by quarrels between students and staff on matters such as restrictions on clothing, political activity, student newspapers, and racial symbols. Behavior which does not disturb the educational process should not be restricted..................................... 38

4. Cross Cultural Clashes. An important point is made that when large numbers of young people and adults come from very different neighborhoods, very different racial and ethnic strands, and very different age brackets are mixed, the result is often a serious lack of communication. When school staffs impose a middle class, white life style on minority students, staffs are often accused

Page

of being racists or moralists or worse. It is our view that these clashes will occur most frequently in the moderate, middle class high schools into which are bussed significant numbers of low income students and less in either all white or all black school settings. Mention of current conflict in newly integrated southern schools is made.. 39

5. Classification of Students and Career Counseling. The process by which academic and career counseling is carried out creates considerable unrest in any big city high school. There is much ambiguity as to the standards which should be used. The logistics of counseling are so burdensome as to create a feeling of impersonality and lack of care.. 41

6. The Increasing Politicalization of Schools. As with the universities, most urban public high schools are inexorably sucked into the important political quarrels of the day. Students are activated by the media, by local community leadership, and by the more political teachers at the school. Some discussion of "outside agitators".. 41

PART IV

STRATEGIES FOR RESPONSE

A. CONTROL DEVICES

1. Police, frisks, and searches. The extent of use of uniformed police in schools is reported from the questionnaire survey. A positive example is described from Kettering Senior High School in Detroit. In another area of the country, an ominous arsenal of long and ugly knives.......... 44

2. School Systems Security Forces. We recommend that the most effective control device is the use of indigenous young adults on a regular, full time, paid basis in and around central city schools. Examples are given............. 45

Page

3. Suspension and/or Expulsion. This age old control device is discussed in the light of current conditions....... 46

4. In-School Detention. Half the principals responding to the questionnaire report that they have a kind of detention area in their schools. Some are operated in a constructive manner; others are almost silly................ 47

5. Changing Configurations of Students. A variety of tactics are discussed, such as cancellation of athletic events, shortened school days, the staggering of both entrance and departure times, and so on..................... 48

B. REDUCTION OF ACADEMIC RIGIDITIES

While it is easier to operate a fairly simple academic regimen, students respond positively to more electives, different time-span courses, spontaneous field trips, wider and more varied schedule options, and opportunities for academic credit for outside activities such as tutoring. A most useful example is given from the John Adams High School in Portland, Oregon.............................. 49

C. UNDERSTANDING AND HONORING CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

Minority group programs and organizations are discussed, as are the problems of honoring ethnic heroes. Principals' views on the wisdom of promoting or recruiting ethnic teachers in predominately ethnic schools are presented. The Policy Institute emphasizes the importance of youth in teachers. The principals surveyed do not seem to agree................ 50

D. ENLARGING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

The Policy Institute expresses its mild surprise that students are voting on only half of the conduct policy bodies at schools surveyed. On the other hand, there are voting students on a fifth of the curriculum committees observed, a percentage we found surprisingly high. Grade requirements for participation in athletics, student government, cheerleading and other extracurricular activities. Recommendation that such requirements are probably no longer useful.. 53

Page

E. ENGAGEMENT OF A SCHOOL'S NATURAL COMMUNITY

A Policy Institute conclusion that schools which cannot find imaginative ways to relate to their sending community will automatically be in trouble. A number of methods are discussed such as standing (rather than ad hoc)crises groups; non-academic out-reach personnel; paid, neighborhood-based security aides at the school; para-professionals; community ombudsman or advocates; and decentralization.................. 54

F. PRINCIPAL STYLES AND COMMUNICATION

The special and unique role of the principalship at any high school, its particular characteristics and its changing face in the 1970's. Conflict-management the prime task. Several tips for principals regarding disruption..............58

APPENDICES

A. Proposal for this study.

B. Selected Annotated Bibliography.

C. List of Cities.

D. Site-Visit Instrument.

E. Questionnaire and Questionnaire Tables and Commentary.

PART II

SIZE AND NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

There have been three recent and useful studies of high school protest and disruption prior to the Syracuse survey reported in more detail here in Part II. Comparisons among these and ours are rocky at best because all four used different samples and different definitions.

1. In early 1969, the National Association of Secondary School Principals reported on their study of more than 1000 high schools. NASSP found that 59% of the high schools and 56% of the junior high schools had experienced some form of "protest". In defining protest, NASSP included almost any activity that was "out of the ordinary". Analyzing the academic year 1968-1969, this study reported that 10% of the principals responding to the survey had undergone race - related protests.

2. A short time later, Dr. Alan F. Westin, who is Director of the Center for Research and Education in American Liberties at Columbia University, reported that 348 high schools in 38 states had undergone some form of disruption between November 1968 and February 1969, and that an additional 239 schools had suffered "serious" episodes. Westin's research was based on a systematic survey of American newspapers. He found that by May 25, 1969 the total number protests stood at around 2000.

3. The most comprehensive survey in the public domain was conducted by the House Subcommittee on General Education for the year 1968-1969. The Subcommittee sent a questionnaire to all of the nation's 29,000 public, private, and parochial high schools. More than 50% of the schools responded. The Subcommittee's defin-

ition of protest was more akin to the Syracuse survey as it actually listed particular disruptions such as strikes, boycotts, sit-ins, riots, and so on.

As interpreted and summarized by the National School Public Relations Association in its newsletter dated March 2, 1970, the basic findings of the Subcommittee survey were as follows:

A. Eighteen percent of the schools responding had experienced "serious protests".

B. The major issues of protest were disciplinary rules, dress codes, school services and facilities, and curriculum policy.

C. The survey considered racial issues in a separate category and found that this was a factor in more than 50% of the protests in schools with more than 1000 students and in 30% of the smaller schools. Racial issues were involved in city school protests about four times as often as in suburban or rural schools.

D. Of all schools responding, 20% had had "a significant increase in minority group enrollment in the past five years". Of this group, 22% had experienced student protests compared to only 16% of schools who had not had a significant increase in minority group involvement.

4. The Syracuse survey finds that 85% of the schools responding to its questionnaire in June of 1970 had experienced some type of disruption (in the past three years) as defined in Tables I and II.* Table I also gives the percentage of responding schools which suffered each particular type of disruption and whether that particular disruption had a racial basis. Table II which follows breaks down the same information by regions of the United States.

Appendix E presents the questionnaire and a large variety of interesting conclusions from the Syracuse survey. Significant among these are:

---

* pp. 17-21

A. The size of the student body is a more important variable than the size of the city in which a school is located. Larger schools have more problems.

B. Disruption is positively related to integration. Schools which are almost all white or all black are less likely to be disrupted. This might suggest a policy of apartheid as a solution to disruption, but this option is unavailable. Among other drawbacks, it is unconstitutional. The Kerner Commission spoke of other drawbacks with considerable vigor. In sum, a society polarized between white and black would be almost impossible to manage without even raising the moral stature of the nation as a question. A segregated educational system would hardly train the young for an integrated future when they become adults.

C. Integrated schools with higher percentages of black students are less likely to be disrupted if such schools also have high percentages of black staffs. Conversely, schools with high percentages of blacks but with predominately white staffs are more likely to be disrupted.

D. Disruption and average daily attendance are directly related. Where average daily attendance is lower, disruption is higher and vice versa.

E. Principals with the least experience in their office:

   1. Report greater black enrollments.
   2. Endorse a more active response to disruption (in contrast to "riding it out").
   3. Report a greater concern for positive preventive training programs.
   4. Are more hesitant to project the blame for disruption on to external, non-school factors.

TABLE I

A Summary of Reported Disruption In The Past Three Years
In Terms Of
Percentage of Schools Affected*

	Did Not Occur	Occurred	Occurred No Racial Basis	Occurred Somewhat Racial Basis	Occurred Substantial Racial Basis
Teacher boycott, walkout, or strike	77	22	21	1	0
Student boycott, walkout, or strike	66	33	13	9	11
Arson	78	21	16	3	2
Property damage other than arson	43	56	47	6	3
Rioting	88	11	2	3	6
Student-teacher physical confrontation	69	29	16	10	3
Picketing or parading	74	25	15	4	6
Presence on campus of unruly, unauthorized, non-school persons	45	54	32	14	8
Abnormal unruliness	65	33	13	14	6

* Percentages in any given category, in this table and in all others, will not necessarily sum to 100% because of occasional omissions of particular responses by principals.

TABLE II

U. S. Government Field Regions Used in the Syracuse Survey

Region #	Region	States
1	NEW ENGLAND	Connecticut Maine Massachusetts New Hampshire Rhode Island Vermont
2	NEW YORK-NEW JERSEY	New Jersey New York
3	MID-ATLANTIC	Delaware Kentucky Maryland North Carolina Pennsylvania Virginia West Virginia D. C.
4	SOUTH	Alabama Florida Georgia Mississippi South Carolina Tennessee
5	MID-WEST	Illinois Indiana Michigan Minnesota Ohio Wisconsin
6	SOUTHWEST	Arkansas Louisiana New Mexico Oklahoma Texas
7	MOUNTAIN	Colorado Idaho Iowa Kansas Missouri Montana Nebraska North Dakota South Dakota Utah Wyoming
8	WEST	Alaska Arizona California Hawaii Nevada Oregon Washington

TABLE II (Cont.)

A Summary of Reported Disruption in Terms of Percentage of Schools Affected by Region

	Did Not Occur								Occurred							
Region #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Teacher boycott, walkout, or strike	67	72	85	75	62	90	91	86	33	28	15	24	38	9	10	11
Student boycott, walkout, or strike	50	47	65	71	60	86	75	72	50	53	34	28	39	12	24	25
Arson	73	77	83	86	67	91	91	73	27	23	17	11	31	7	10	23
Property damage (other than arson)	30	35	51	46	37	57	51	38	70	65	49	52	62	42	50	60
Rioting	87	81	85	92	84	97	91	87	13	18	14	6	15	2	9	9
Student-Teacher physical confrontation	73	67	68	77	57	81	75	72	27	32	32	22	42	18	24	24
Picketing or Parading	53	56	78	79	70	84	83	73	47	45	22	20	28	14	18	22
Presence on campus of unruly, unauthorized, non-school persons	20	40	50	47	42	52	43	49	81	60	50	51	56	46	57	48
Abnormal unruliness	63	63	64	67	62	71	74	65	37	38	36	33	38	28	25	31

TABLE II (Cont.)

A Summary of Reported Disruption in Terms of Percentage of Schools Affected by Region (continued)

	Occurred: No Racial Basis								Occurred: Somewhat Racial Basis							
Region #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Teacher boycott, walkout, or strike	30	21	15	23	36	9	8	10	3	7	0	1	1	0	0	1
Student boycott, walkout, or strike	33	21	17	13	11	5	4	9	7	16	9	7	11	2	9	7
Arson	20	21	14	10	24	7	6	17	0	2	2	0	4	0	2	6
Property damage (other than arson)	60	56	42	45	49	38	42	52	0	9	5	6	7	2	8	5
Rioting	3	0	5	1	2	2	0	1	3	9	2	1	6	0	0	2
Student-Teacher physical confrontation	20	16	18	11	23	9	9	15	7	14	12	9	13	5	11	6
Picketing or Parading	37	26	18	10	12	9	8	17	3	12	2	2	6	3	6	2
Presence on campus of unruly, unauthorized, non-school persons	57	35	29	26	29	36	32	33	17	16	12	16	16	7	17	10
Abnormal unruliness	27	12	16	11	9	16	8	15	3	19	13	16	19	12	13	10

TABLE II (Cont.)

A Summary of Reported Disruption in Terms of Percentage of Schools Affected by Region (continued)

	Occurred: Substantial Racial Basis							
Region #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Teacher boycott, walkout, or strike	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0
Student boycott, walkout, or strike	10	16	8	8	17	5	11	9
Arson	7	0	1	1	3	0	2	0
Property damage (other than arson)	10	0	2	1	6	2	0	3
Rioting	7	9	7	4	7	0	9	6
Student-Teacher physical confrontation	0	2	2	2	6	3	4	3
Picketing or Parading	7	7	2	8	10	2	4	3
Presence on campus of unruly, unauthorized, non-school persons	7	9	9	9	11	3	8	5
Abnormal unruliness	7	7	7	6	10	0	4	6

PART III

CAUSES

INTRODUCTION

It is commonplace to point out that, as with other social institutions, no school is an island unto itself. It is a place on a continuum characterized by very complicated social chemistry. And, a public secondary school has two other features of enormous significance. First, most of its students are required to be there, and second, they are adolescents.

It is, of course, absurd to lay all the blame for disruption on the schools. Everyone knows that they import massive doses of social and educational difficulty everyday they are open. It is equally absurd to say, in the words of a few very defensive schoolmen, that a school is "merely a receptacle for problems it does not create and cannot be responsible for." With these two untenable positions in mind, we have divided this section on causes of disruption into two parts -- Societal Causes and In-school Causes. Actually, these terms are inadequate shorthand for the continuum along which disruption occurs, and for the informal feedbacks and reinforcements that relate events in the larger society to the school -- and vice versa.

A. SOCIETAL CAUSES:

1. Violence in America

Today's high school student lives in a violent time. Every day, physical confrontations between and among humans in America are in the news. Urban riots have become almost commonplace since the first serious eruption in Watts in the summer of 1965. Legitimate violence in the form of an ugly little guerrilla war in Southeast Asia is part of the daily media diet of high school students.

In the Fall of 1969, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence delivered a ghastly prediction for American central cities in which the secondary schools examined in this study exist. The Commission warned that center cities would be almost ghost towns after dark except for high-powered and ubiquitous police surveillance. The Commission predicted a fortress mentality and climate in which, during the day, millions of adolescents would be going to school.

While there has been a long history of violence in this country, and while experts continually point out that it is a significant part of our national culture, there is a very special character to American violence after World War II. The medium of TV has brought that violence, wherever it has occurred, into almost every dwelling place in the nation. If there is a high school riot in Brooklyn, and there have been significant disturbances there, students in Seattle or Atlanta are likely to watch a portion of it on their own TV. The incidence of violence in America is one thing; the very pungent portrayal of it on TV is another. In terms of behavioral stimuli, the addition of the two is not arithmetic, it may be geometric.

Moreover, nobody in America knows violence more directly than the urban poor, black or white. For it is in the center cities where the incidence of physical crime is highest. In addition, there is an ominous social statistic to add to the gloom. Poor urban youth, age 15 to 24, are the most crime-prone segment of the American population, and they will increase disproportionately at least until 1975.*

---

* As reported in TIME magazine, July 13, 1970, p. 34, in a careful article on American police problems.

2. The Success of Civil Rights Protests in the 1960's

There are two crucial features about the civil rights movement since the Reverend Martin Luther King first organized the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama. From that moment in the late 50's, and on through the first half of the next decade, Americans were demonstrating against laws and practices which were on the books. And in the North, these protests and demonstrations, often leading to violence, were awarded great legitimacy by many of the most morally perceptive in the citizenry at large. It was a case, thus, of morally legitimate, direct opposition to established authority. Few urban high school students, studying those events or watching them portrayed on TV tapes, would miss the point. Many of them told us on our school visits that when the rules were "wrong," they had a "right" to get them changed -- and by almost any means.

The significant second feature of the civil rights movement is that it worked. The whole legal underpinning of authoritative discrimination was wiped out. This fact has not escaped American adolescents either.

3. Visibility and Apparent Success of College Protests

No one should underestimate the ripple effect on high schools of repeated college and university disruption starting at Berkeley in the middle of the last decade. Those protests have been noisy, articulate, often violent, and, again, much publicized. While the affinity of high school and college students is a debatable subject, both are students; both are in educational institutions; both have teachers, counselors, coaches, and so on. During the April 1970 disorders at Berkeley, many of the non-university students involved turned out to be high school students.

A direct example of this "ripple" factor occurred in Syracuse, New York after the Cambodian decision and the killings at Kent and Jackson State.

Syracuse University was effectively shut down for a period of days, all of its entrances barricaded by great piles of junk and debris, and classes in effect cancelled. The turmoil around the University received loud local publicity. During the ensuing week, numerous disrupting disturbances broke out in three high schools, including walkouts and, in one case, severe racial conflict. We cannot prove the direct causal relationship between these events, but the relationship does seem plausible to the point of virtual certitude. We do have copies of inflamatory flyers that were common in the high schools during the week of troubles; and we do know that they were delivered there by university students, although, of course, the causes of the disruption were much more complicated.

Here again, as with the civil rights movement, these college protests have, at least in the short-range, seemed largely successful. Partly as a result of the protests, very significant changes in authority relationships in higher education are occurring. Once again, the message to the adolescent is that disruption works.

4. The Expression of Ethnic/Racial Pride

Historically, the public schools have had the very special function of certifying for the young what is "right," what is customary, what is legitimate, what is expected, what is laudable, and what is "wrong" in the American society. Analysis of the political history of the public schools indicates that they have been essentially a middle class instrument. In this century, they separated themselves from general local government and, in effect, established a discrete government with all the trappings of legislatures (school boards) and separate revenue systems. With the help of these protective instruments, the schools have been the great middle class device to "Americanize others." Anyone now examining the urban public high school is quickly aware that this historic function is no longer viable.

Since the 1950's, there has been a loud and pungent expression of racial and ethnic pride particularly among three of America's most oppressed minorities -- the blacks, the Chicanos, and the American Indian. (One big city police chief told us that "the Chicanos are the militants; the decent ones like to be called Mexican-Americans.") When this long delayed eruption of pride hit the adolescent world, it came as not surprising that the reaction included great concerns for style, looks, language, and the tense relationships among people. The schools, as certifiers of what is right and wrong in such matters, are now on treacherous ground. These ethnic and racial groups, sharply encouraged by political and other victories, will simply not be instructed by administrative fiat any longer. It is our pleasure to report that among the 27 schools examined, there was very little "fiat" remaining. The ground is especially treacherous because the public schools must be responsible directly and frequently to local voters for authority and money, knowing that among those voters are large numbers of people who feel threatened by the current expressions of racial and ethnic pride.

Nor will this school problem abate. As the open American society opens further, both vertically and in its tolerance for differing standards and mores, then the level and complexity of the demands made on public high schools will continue to rise sharply.

5. Participatory Democracy

Since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which set up the "War on Poverty," there has been an increasing and unprecedented effort on the part of low-income groups to participate meaningfully in the formation of American public policy. The mandate in that act, "maximum feasible participation," may have produced a variety of problems, but to the poor that mandate was clear. All over the country, neighborhood centers and programs emerged governed in large part by local residents many of whom were the recipients of the public services under consideration. In many cities, the logical extension of "maximum feasible participation" has been the formal decentralization of public programs in both legal and administrative terms. The rhetoric surrounding the notion of client participation has been heady indeed. And it has not escaped urban high school students.

As expected, students demand to participate meaningfully in policy formation on matters such as student government, social affairs, school rules on clothing and hair styles, school political organizations and activity, attendance, smoking, movement through buildings, and so on. More and more, they are picking up the cry of a lack of curricular "relevance," and they wish to be included on bodies which decide the course of study.

It seems clear to us that the social forces set in motion by the war on poverty (and its successor programs such as model cities) will not abate in the foreseeable future. And, as most of the high schools we visited are heavily enrolled with low-income youngsters, we would expect students to bring to school the signals they are hearing in their low income neighborhoods -- that of meaningful involvement in decisions about who does what to whom and with whom.

In taking this view, we have no illusions about the inherent complexities of participatory democracy. Among things learned by the poverty warriors in the late 1960's was that maximum participation costs enormous amounts of time taken up by enormous amounts of talk. Moreover, misunderstandings, large and small, are easy to trigger; the various motives of the various participants are frequently assaulted, and impatience runs high. In the schools, participating students are the most transient element in such a system, and school officials inevitably get the feeling that they must re-invent the participation wheel every time another class comes along.

On the other hand, it is almost a truism to point out that when people being regulated have a real say in regulations, they are much more likely to adhere to them. But even more important values ensue. Students quickly learn that the management of a public institution such as school is a complicated affair largely because of the variety of legitimate pressures leaning on such institutions. There really are taxpayers, and they really must have a certain basic respect for the institutions they are supporting. And we believe from our visits that students soon find there is no such thing as "the students' point of view." We had significant numbers of low-income youngsters, both black and white, who told us in no uncertain terms that "there is not enough discipline around here."

6. Slum Life Styles

Many social observers have pointed to the special characteristics of the urban slum, which sends so many students to the schools included in this study. Most commonly emphasized are features such as a general, noisy disorderliness; a threatening lack of sustaining security in the face of hand-to-mouth economics; and, in the case of black ghettoes or Mexican barrios, the distressing feeling of being closed in by a powerful white establishment. When Richardson Dilworth, now chairman of the Philadelphia school board, was mayor of that city, he referred to the "white noose tied around Philadelphia by its suburbs." New census evidence indicates that "the white noose" is neither as tight nor as long-lasting as Dilworth feared. But in the short-run it is a reality for many of the lowest income slum dwellers.

Administrators, teachers, parents, community organizers, and students all agree that the established white society has simply failed to comprehend the depth of ghetto squalor and filth that surrounds many of these young people. In several of the cities we visited, such neighborhoods often defy description. Broken glass and other debris is everywhere; predators in the form of drunks, junkies, fairies, and pimps abound amidst many fatherless children, surly fourteen year olds, and the vacant, tired stares of old men and old women who have long since given up the fight for simple decency against these monstrous odds. To expect young people surrounded by such squalor to come to school everyday and to perform more or less like their middle class compatriots is simply absurd. One conselor told us the sad little tale about her sitting in her office one morning trying to console a student who had been badly frightened by an assault by his father on his mother with a knife just before he left for school. He sat in her office with his "stingy brimmed" hat on and this attracted the attention of an administrator who abruptly interrupted the conversation, complaining loudly about the lack of courtesy shown by the presence of the hat "while talking to a lady." That same counselor sighed defeatedly.

Slum squalor produces a deep and abiding desire to extricate one's self and, in the words of many black students, "get some of the bread those white cats have." Thus we found the historic feeling, so often expressed by the earlier American underdogs, that school was the way out; that in effect the school was the great equalizer. Whether in fact it is poses a most puzzling and important question -- a question that is rather vaguely but increasingly understood by many of these center city students. When the schools fail to meet the expectations of the upwardly mobile, it simply does not do to try to explain the failure on the basis of complicated and subtle relationships between a center-city public school and its wider and more powerful constituencies such as labor unions, mercantile organizations, church groups, and taxpayer's organizations.

We suspect from our visits that the most difficult educational message being attempted by these schools is to convince low-income youngsters that impulsive and spontaneous behavior, while often fun, is not the route to riches in this society as it is now organized. Educators and others talk about "gratification postponement." We merely observe how hard it is to sell a concept such as that to youngsters from families who have only a fingernail hold on the world in which they live.

7. Black Revenge

It may be an unpleasant subject, but no honest observers of the urban high school scene could by-pass the phenomenon of Black revenge. We found it sad but psychologically understandable when numbers of Black high school students told us one way or another that "it's Whitey's turn to take some heat." We note that most urban black young people are fully aware of the long and ugly centuries of disgrace in which they and their kind were oppressed purely on the basis of color. It would be pompous to suggest that white observers can fully comprehend the depth of this attenuated hurt. We found that much of the physical fighting, the extortion, the bullying in and around schools had a clear racial basis. This was particularly apparent where the student mix was predominately but not wholly Black. White students are hesitant to express their fears on this subject, but those fears are very real and run very deep. Some were finally willing to tell us that they traveled only in large white groups, studiously avoiding physical proximity to black groups, and "getting the hell out of there as fast as we can."

Websters Collegiate Dictionary defines revenge as "an opportunity for getting satisfaction or retrieving one's self." The long and unpleasant history of black-white relations in this country and elsewhere should make the meaning of that definition obvious. And it is the urban public high school that has to deal with the problem in terms of its most egoistic manifestations.

8. Racism - Black and White

The basic conclusions in the now famous Kerner Commission Report were two:

First, the American nation is steadily building two separate societies, one black and one white; and, second, the fundamental cause for this polarization is white racism. No document such as this report on school disruption need spend much time describing that racism. It is deep, abiding, and pervasive. The signals, some unperceived some almost imperceptible to whites, are clear, constant, and continually discouraging to black Americans. Whether it is that endless, daily series of little glances, snubs, and petty insults that say to the non-white in America "you are second; in fact, you are not really here;" or whether racism comes in the form of an outright assault on a tiny handful of bussed-in black students (which had occurred at one school we studied); the long history of social and economic inferiority for blacks in America continues to take its heavy toll.

However, in our opinion, much that happens by word or deed in the high schools is often called racist when it really is not. Often decisions are made in counselors' offices, on athletic fields, or in connection with other extra-curricular activities that seem to minority students to be racially based. There is no doubt at all that many are so based, but it is also true that many simply are not. Such decisions are inevitable in a high school setting, and when their effects are badly complicated by charges of racism where there is no basis for it, the running level of unrest is merely aggravated. Sometimes, of course, purely racist practices are expressions of deep and tragic cultural traditions. For example, in one southern city we visited we were told that while white teachers, in a newly integrated school, could feel free to punish both black and white students, black teachers are advised to leave the punishment of white students up to white teachers "until our desegregation efforts stabilize."

On the other side, there is a disturbing black racism which announces, flat out, that white society in America is irredeemably racist, irreparably racist, and that only some kind of apocalyptic explosion of black rage against historic oppression could bring that racist white society to its knees. We talked to some very tough, articulate black students in every part of the country except the South who expressed this position firmly. Needless to say, schoolmen faced with any significant number of students holding this view have their daily work cut out for them.

9. The Television Generation

It is safe to say that this generation of Americans is the first generation anywhere in history to receive graphic portrayals of almost every feature of the society in which they live. One hundred million television sets tell a drum fire story everyday and night of what is deemed newsworthy almost anywhere in the country. There are many unique features of the television generation, but only two need be pointed out in this context. First, a whole society is almost forced to see daily the grotesqueness of its blemishes, and there are social psychologists who are seriously asking whether any society can stand that. For the adolescent young, there is no innocence. The discrepancy between the nation's claims and its actual practices is starkly pictured. The results, as so many have pointed out, is the assault by the young on the hypocrisy "of those over 30." The mistrust runs deep. At one meeting with New York City high school students, where the young people were promised the protection of anonymity, not a single student would discuss disruption until a tape recorder had not only been shut off but physically removed from the room.

Second, education is suddenly a much bigger word than it used to be. Only a fraction of it goes on inside school buildings. One salutary effect has been a sharp widening of subjects to be considered. For instance, no longer can an instructor either ignore or misrepresent racial conflict in the South when most of his students have just watched a force of Alabama police on horseback run down a long line of black women at a bridge in Selma. Nor can a war in Indochina be described in any other way than honestly when students, like others, get a heavy daily dose of moving pictures from that unhappy land.

As suggested earlier, graphic and incessant TV publicity of disruptions in the whole society creates a climate which, in our opinion, makes disruptions in a high school much more likely.

10. "Situation Ethics" and the New Permissiveness

It is almost trite to point to the relaxation of old restrictions and taboos in this country since World War II, as, for example, in matters of sex and its portrayal, or in the field of drugs and their wide-spread use in spite of laws. These in fact may be "for instances" of a more general observation that authority systems are on public trial almost everywhere in the world. The effect on the adolescent young has been obvious. Schools are natural arenas for clashes between diverging old and new cultures. Dress and grooming codes, censureship of student newspapers, symbols such as the "black liberation flag" or the clenched fist, all these become matters of tense and difficult negotiations. It is doubtful that urban public schools can any longer say "no" to a Leroy Jones poem in class when that same poem appeared in Life magazine the week before. Schoolmen will find it ever more difficult to restrict some of the art work being done in class by young people who can see a far more candid X-rated movie anytime at a local drive-in.

The schools, of course, are caught in the middle of this generational crunch. Most of the teachers and administrators we talked to would have to be classified as generally sympathetic to students in such matters. But, here again, the public education system has other constituents who are not sympathetic and do not intend to be. Quarrels about the new permissiveness can and have triggered serious disruption. At one school, the black students wished to put some very testy, anti-white lines in a black play being performed in the school auditorium. The administrators exacted a promise from them that several particularly heady lines would be omitted. When the play was performed, the lines were nevertheless used and a serious disturbance between whites and blacks ensued.

"Situation Ethics" is not a phrase used by high school students so far as we know. But when they say, as they do, that in effect, you might as well live it up because "you might get your head busted by the pigs tomorrow" or "you might get drafted the minute you walk out the door," they are describing a philosophy of temporary and short-range ethics. The more politically oriented students can tell you that there are no longer any rights and wrongs, only what is right for the particular moment at hand.

"May you live in interesting times" goes an ancient Chinese curse.

B. IN-SCHOOL CAUSES:

Introduction

As we have suggested earlier, the causes of high school disruption run on a circular continuum from the wider society, on through the schools, and back to the wider society. There is no sensible way to clearly differentiate among these causes. Like the strands in a marble cake, they run so closely together and take such unexpected turns and twists, that discrete categorization is impossible. For a simple example, a running quarrel between two youth gangs from different housing projects may produce a serious fight at the school which they both attend. In no real sense is this the school's "fault" even though it is the location of the fracas and indeed may get publicity that it is a "trouble" school where severe fighting often takes place.

Nevertheless there are some in-school causes of disruption -- in the sense that certain school practices can foment dissatisfaction and trigger serious interruption of the educational process. Even more important, these in-school problems are inevitably mixed with the wider societal causes and are interpreted and perceived by students as part of that wider mix. It is this chemistry that makes these difficulties so pungent. In short, in the words of one rather myopic schoolman, "If we could just run our own school, it would be peaceful." Said whimsically, it is a pleasant remark. Said seriously, it is foolish and dangerous.

1. Student Involvement in Policy

There is healthy debate in every school we visited as to the relative weight to give student views in matters of school practices and policies. We met no administrators who felt that students should not be involved. Naturally, there is considerable and honest difference of opinion concerning both the extent of involvement and the types of practices where students should have more influence than in others. Two areas of concern popped up frequently, and a third is beginning to loom on the horizon. First, social codes, including dress and grooming regulations and policies governing extracurricular activities are of great concern to students. When students feel that prescriptions on these matters are made by adults only, they show considerable unrest. Second, limits and restrictions governing who can and who cannot participate in athletics and cheerleading are important. Students we talked to are generally opposed to grade requirements, attendance and tardiness limits, or other ways to circumscribe such participation. (Sometimes an apparently small matter can cause serious irritation. Some high schools still require a student to pay his $1.00 or $2.00 dues to the student government as a condition of voting for representation on that government.) Serious unrest has occurred in integrated schools when restrictions cause the student government, football team, or cheerleader squad to be essentially white and clearly disproportionate to the racial makeup of the student body.

We believe that the motives of schoolmen in imposing grades and similar restrictions related to extracurricular activities, at least in the North, are purely educational. Such restrictions are an old and accepted practice, even in colleges and universities. But they are now frequently interpreted as racist practices by non-white students, and are probably no longer worth the effort.

Curriculum planning is rapidly becoming a third major issue. It is undoubtedly a much more complicated problem. We found much ambiguity in the prescriptions issued by students, parents, staff, and teachers. On the one hand, students seem to demand representation on curriculum bodies so as to secure a "current curriculum" which will convey high school graduates to a good paying job the day after commencement exercises. On the other hand, there is a somewhat more ambiguous demand for preparation "which keeps the options open after graduation" -- for college, for specific technical careers, or for a good-paying job the day after commencement. High school curriculum bodies, of course, wrestle with these difficulties constantly. Whether such bodies should include voting students, the most transient constituency of a school, raises complicated and complicating issues. What we do know is that over the next few years, there will be increasing demands for such representation. If ignored, such demands can lead to further unrest.

2. Facilities

For persons not accustomed to visiting large urban public high schools, the experience can be a bit startling. Bells ringing, buzzers sounding, public address systems making all those announcements, thousands of noisy, energetic adolescents pushing and shoving their way through crowded halls and stairways, locker doors banging, books or other things being dropped, and so on -- all these and many more give an impression of unmanageable social interaction in which education is effectively precluded. At the same time, after visiting enough institutions around the country one can feel a clear difference between a school which is essentially a happy one and a school which is not. The differences show up in the tone of the noise, not necessarily its level, and especially in the kinds of brief human contacts among adult staff, hall guards or whatever, and students moving hurriedly to their next assignment. The smiling level is important. The kinds of jocular interplay are probably more important. In the most interesting schools we visited, there was a subtle mixture of obvious respect and obvious friendliness which seemed ever present and, significantly, which ran both ways.

Some of these schools were clearly overcrowded physically. It is just plain tiring to go to classes which are clearly too large, assemblies which are merely bubbly mass meetings, bathrooms where the lines are obviously too long, and to fumble around in front of a locker shared by one or two others on the main floor of a building which was clearly not designed to accommodate such furniture. We were often told that urban people are wholly accustomed to this kind of melee. Whether they are or are not, many of them will tell you that they do not like such a mess. Whether school officials by themselves can do anything about this is doubtful. New physical facilities, clearly needed, are very expensive and attract the immediate attention of taxpayers. We merely note that overcrowding, its attendant noise and fatigue, provides a ripe climate for disruption.

3. Restrictions on Behavior

We have referred earlier to efforts by schools to limit "deviant" clothing and hair styles. This remains a constant bone of contention between students and staff. When it takes on racial or ethnic features, the contention becomes far more serious. We suspect that everyone would agree that nakedness at school is prohibited because, by itself, it disrupts education. On the other hand, restrictions against bell-bottom pants, long hair, "Afro's," and beads are probably useless and offensive.

But, other restrictions can become even more sticky. One principal told us that a black group in his school wished to have exclusive use of a particular sector of the cafeteria, remove the American flag from that area, and substitute the Black Liberation flag. It is difficult to see how permission for this behavior could be given but it was. The results were wholly predictable. Parent groups, many teachers, and school-system officials soon were outraged. The compromise was both flags at equal height in an unofficially designated, but black area of the cafeteria.

Restrictions on smoking continue to annoy students who smoke. "Hall passes" irritate students. Rules such as automatic expulsion from a class after a maximum number of absences have produced serious quarrels. Censorship of student newspapers, whether subtle or very direct, has produced a proliferation of underground newspapers now common to the American public high school.

Honest people of good will can argue the relative merits of restrictions on behavior and differ widely. Here again, we merely point out that these limits on adolescent life leave a running level of dispute among the many publics of a school.

4. Cross-cultural Clashes

One cannot visit urban high schools and not be directly aware of the clashes produced by mixing large numbers of young people and adults who come from very different neighborhoods, very different racial and ethnic strands, and very different age brackets. For example, we were impressed with the serious lack of communication often occurring when older teachers stay on in a school that has become very different in its ethnic and income characteristics. Such teachers are often called "racists" or "moralists" or worse. The basic problem, however, may simply be the very difficult adjustments such teachers and staff have to make to a rapidly changing social chemistry in their schools and classrooms. Many of these teachers are clearly "old pro's" in their own right, but they no longer "belong," that is, they are simply inappropriate for the kinds of demanding tasks that new constituencies and new expectations have produced.

Of course, age is not the only problem. Well-meaning schoolmen will frequently celebrate the birthday of a famous Spanish conquistador, but when a small militant group of Chicanos would also like to honor Zapata, there is only silence from the front office. Or (no analogy intended) when special ceremonies are held to honor a Booker T. Washington or a Martin Luther King, disruptions can occur not because black students dishonor these men, but because their request similarly to honor Malcolm X was ignored.

It is our considered judgment that disruptions caused by these kinds of issues will occur most frequently in moderate-income, middle class schools into which are bussed significant numbers of low-income students, and not in either the predominantly- or all-white or all-black school settings. By way of illustration, in the southern schools visited there was little evidence of serious disruption based on racial conflict. We believe this will change as southern schools become more and more integrated. Dissatisfactions already manifest in northern integrated schools will arise in the South and will provide ready ingredients for disturbance. There is already evidence of this in recent newspaper accounts of testimony before Senator Walter Mondale's committee by black students in newly integrated southern schools.

5. Classification of Students and Career Counseling

One of the most difficult things that educators do is to engage in the career-sorting process. The way the process is carried out, and the well-known limits on educational knowledge about the process, create considerable unrest in the big city high school. Here, too, there is much ambiguity in the minds and feelings of staff, students, parents, and community organizations. Many students and parents feel that almost irrevocable and obviously crucial decisions are made as early as the ninth grade. This is the level at which curricular tracks and programs are frequently established. Counselors are clearly aware of the national controversy swirling around the whole question of tests and their meaning for central city students. Counselors are also aware of the logistic needs of the school -- filling up its program quotas and class levels, for example.

In any case, with hundreds of students to consult, those responsible for the tracking and career counseling system seem impersonal, mechanical, and once more "not caring" or worse -- that is, influenced by racial and class prejudice. The style of career counseling is an increasingly serious in-school cause of deep frustration and unrest.

6. The Increasing Politicalization of Schools

It would come as no surprise to any big city principal to be told that a huge backlog of emotional freight produced by some very rough social conflicts in our time is being dumped on his school. Black students coming to school with the heady message of black power or white students coming to school with a "NEVER" button would only be two symbols of the inexorable process by which the public schools are being sucked into the important social quarrels of the day. The inter-generational gap, referred to earlier, adds fuel to this fire as well. The impatience level among adolescents runs high. As is the case in many universities, students want the school to be a stronger social force for goals they consider correct and necessary. Students, naturally, are politicized by the media, by local community leadership, and indeed by the more political teachers at the school.

If politicized students are deeply dissatisfied and urging action, they will probably create some kind of scene right at the school for the very simple reason that that is where they are. It is commonplace to note that adolescents have very little leverage on the wider society's politics, so they strike where they are and where they do have leverage. The management of these very important social conflicts within a school is probably the toughest problem administrators have. Simplistic notions that trouble is caused by "outside agitators" will simply not produce constructive solutions. Among Webster's definition of "agitate" are the following phrases, "to give motion to," "to discuss excitedly and earnestly", and "to attempt to arouse public feeling". In these senses, some of the best high school students in America are agitators, and a healthy secondary school is proud of them. The best teachers and staff people we observed deftly wove these deeply felt problems into academic courses where appropriate, thus channeling emotions into behavioral insights and analyses. The worst staffs would either ignore or gloss over these matters, much to the peril of the school, and certainly to the detriment of the education of its students. To do the former is admittedly not easy; to do the latter, in our time, is foolish.

PART IV

STRATEGIES FOR RESPONSE

If the causes of disruption in urban high schools are complex, so are the cures. Our investigations have led us to the conclusion that, short of a total moral conversion, the American society will continue to behave in such a way as to insure some degree of pathological unrest in our urban high schools for some time to come.

The real question is not whether some magic structural or administrational formulae exist to induce behavioral tranquility. The real questions are whether there are proven tactical expedients that seem to soften the most disruptive manifestations of unrest, and whether there are longer-range "cooling" strategems that give promise of getting at some of the basic causes of present troubles? And, are there current school practices that tend to make matters worse?

From our own interviews and questionnaires, and from the perceptive insights of other investigators and reporters, we have abstracted information and judgments that hopefully are illuminating and helpful.

A. CONTROL DEVICES

The most traditional ways of dealing with school disruption are directly punitive: e.g. suspension; expulsion; police arrest; in-school detention; direct (and occasionally brutal) referral to parental discipline.

The reasons why many school authorities continue to turn too often to such practices have roots deep in the bogs of past educational habits.

In the present school setting, except in the case of the most calamitous emergencies, adoption of unimaginative and traditional control devices seems to produce perverse and contraproductive results. Tensions and violence tend to be increased rather than reduced; basic constitutional rights, involving both substantive and procedural "due process," tend to be violated -- thereby increasing the feeling of all too many young people that they are victims of authoritarian whim, not subjects of the equitable law that in civics classes they are asked to reverence.

We find it encouraging that imaginative variations on the traditional theme of "control devices" exists, and, in a number of contexts, seem to produce felicitous results.

Take, for example, the use of uniformed police. Six percent of our responding principals indicated that they have uniformed police in their school buildings regularly. Sixty-six percent have police "on call". Only 28 percent "never" have police in their school buildings.

But an impressive half of the principals agreed with the statement that "the mere presence of uniformed police inside a school building is often a cause rather than a deterrent of school disruption." Because of this widespread recognition of the often perverse consequences of having the community's major agents of law and order inside school buildings, many administrators have experimented with novel ways of enhancing the security of persons and property.

For example, at Kettering Senior High School in Detroit, one of the newer schools in the city and one characterized by sprawling one-story "campus" design and by a great deal of pride in its many successes, there are "Detroit Rangers."

These are young, specially trained and better educated policemen, assigned on a permanent basis. They carry out their patrol on miniature motorcycles, thereby giving themselves the range and mobility that an administrator, teacher, or other control agent could never achieve on foot. As a result, the fights, crap games, and threatening clusters of people in and around the school can be reached quickly, observed, and if necessary dispersed. Our site visitor found these officers to be especially effective because they are permanently assigned and have taken very special pains to know large numbers of students on a first-name and informal basis.

Some schools have substituted young adult "security forces" for regular police. A good example of this is found at Berkeley High School (West Campus) in California. There they have a number of "community aides" who are not parents but low-profile "police" who cover hallways, bathrooms, outside yard areas, etc. They are dressed in casual, youthful clothing. The students know them, and they know the students. They come from the same neighborhoods. They are fully paid and are part of the regular operating budget of the school. Their task is to stop impending crises, large or small, just as they begin. Their strategy is in direct contrast to some other schools where there exists a last-resort practice of calling in uniformed police when difficulties become severe but little short of that. These "community aides" also have the important function of keeping disruptive non-school people from coming onto the grounds and into the building. They know them, also.

Berkeley (West Campus) has not been entirely peaceful, but this fifty-fifty black/white school, a short distance from the disrupted University of California campus, is one of the most alert and, in terms of this report, successful that we have observed.

It is reassuring to note that 22 percent of our responding principals indicated that they had non-police, non-faculty, school-system security people in their buildings. But that percentage is not high enough.

One variation of this theme is the case of the principal who has in his desk drawer a list of the telephone numbers of older siblings, now graduated but working locally, who will respond to emergency calls to come to the school to quiet some of their younger brothers or sisters.

Turning to other kinds of control devices, all high schools to our knowledge retain the age-old power and practice of suspension and expulsion. The extent of administrative discretion, and the nature of rules and ordinances governing "due process," however, varies substantially among school districts. Even when "due process" is legally clear, procedural requirements may be ignored in practice. A few years ago, Dr. Kenneth Clark discovered that 750 "troublemakers" had been summarily dismissed from a New York City high school --ostensibily on the grounds of "over-crowding" -- even though the formal regulations of the Board of Education governing hearings and parental consultations before suspension or dismissal were clear and unambiguous.

The dilemmas here are real. A few disruptive students can make it quite impossible for the majority in the school community to carry on normal educational functions. On the other hand, throwing disruptive students out of the school and onto the streets is likely to increase delinquent behavior in the wider community, and likely to produce a nucleus of very real "outside agitators" who return to the school building or its periphery for purposes of further disruption.

School authorities tend in some cases to cloud reconciliation by insisting that, in every case, a suspended or expelled student must bring a parent or other adult back to school in order to be reinstated -- a practice common to 85 percent of the schools of our responding principals. This practice can brutalize the troubled and troublesome youngster even further by involving punishment-prone parents in the disciplinary process. Fifty-seven percent of the principals indicated that they invoked older members of a student's family to help discipline him or her. Without some careful discriminating judgment about the life style, compassion, and native intelligence of individual parents, school authorities can unwittingly reinforce the anti-social attitudes and behaviors of troublesome students by involving parents directly in disciplinary processes.

On the positive side, when parents or older siblings or adult friends really care (and they often do), their involvement in behavioral problems can be extraordinarily salutary. But someone in the school system must take the trouble to search them out and to have open, frank, and often times lengthy discussions about the nature of the "problem". A few -- all too few high school principals -- encourage their teachers to make home visits before an edgy student becomes incorrigible.

Prior to, or in lieu of, suspension or expulsion, many school authorities provide for a kind of "detention area" inside the school to which they send unruly students. Half of the principals in our survey indicated that they had such areas. These vary in style from enforced study halls to dark closets with a prison-like atmosphere. While providing a custodial function to protect the majority from the disruptive behavior of an individual or small group, detention areas probably have no healthier effect upon pupils than prisons have upon criminals. The rate of recidivism is high in both cases.

We have no statistics to measure the positive influence of able guidance counsellors or supervisory personnel who take the time and trouble to "work with" a disturbed youngster. Our tentative conclusion, based upon observation, is that such humane concern in crowded urban high schools is rare, intermittently hopeful, and, in the short and superficial run, expensive. As is the case with so many unfortunates in our society, it seems far cheaper and simpler to keep them behind locked doors, and to spare busy schoolmen and pressed taxpayers the expense and effort of socializing the anti-social.

The trouble is that the social costs of a "detention" psychology are in fact inordinately greater (i.e. dependency, delinquency, destruction) than the costs of intelligent, psychological rehabilitation. Too few school systems seem to understand this reality; fewer still have girded themselves to implement civilized perspectives.

The most exemplary practices we have observed in a number of urban settings have involved special schools for the "unruly". These are usually designed to be short-run, socializing agencies (often with a non-school environment) in which intensive efforts are made to "get through" to the student, to discern the nature of his problem, and to help him in a personal way back to heightened and socialized motivations. A public example of this type of institution is the "600" Schools in New York City. Private examples in New York State would be Children's Village in Westchester County or St. Christopher's School in Dobbs Ferry.

Unfortunately, such arrangements are rare. Far more common are the practices symbolized with consummate irony by an old and decaying high school in the East where students in detention spent their time copying the Bill of Rights over and over again.

One final genus of "control devices" should be noted: tactical decisions involving specific configurations of students and/or a wider community of people.

For example, we discovered several cases where athletic events have simply been cancelled in order to avoid predicted disruptions. In one astonishing instance, the events continued but the cheerleaders and fans were banned. Other examples include shortened school days -- to avoid the massing of students in a cafeteria; the staggering of opening and departure times of particular categories of students; and the closing of schools for shorter or longer periods until the particular crises have had a chance to "cool". This latter practice, of course, runs up against state mandates governing school attendance.

Tactical emergency management is a necessary prerogative of school principals and superintendents. We have little advice to give here except that all control devices have consequences and set precedents. The wise school administrator thinks not only about immediate results but about long-term effects. In view of the fact that few school administrators were ever trained in conflict management, the joy is that so many have learned so much so quickly.

B. REDUCTION OF ACADEMIC RIGIDITIES

While it is obvious that it is administratively easier to operate a fairly simple and inflexible academic regimen, students in many high schools we visited responded positively to opportunities for more electives, different time-span courses, spontaneous field trips, wider and more varied schedule options, and academic credit for outside activities such as tutoring. We repeat, arranging a flexible mix of this kind can be an enormous task, but it is our judgment that disruption would be less likely if these opportunities were more amply provided.

An excellent example of experimentation in these matters is the new John Adams High School in Portland, Oregon. This high school is organized as four smaller schools, called Houses. The Houses give each student a home base and a regular group of teachers and students with whom he can identify. Each House contains about 300 randomly assigned students, a guidance counselor, a guidance intern, and a teaching staff. Students at Adams spend a full half-day every day in elective courses. Moreover they can choose to take shorter mini-courses that last only six weeks. These mini-courses, planned by students and faculty members, give students the opportunity to explore more areas of intellectual or career interest. In addition to courses taking place inside the school, an attempt is made to find different learning situations outside in the community. These may range from work on a political campaign, to tutoring elementary school children, to a paid apprenticeship experience. All of these activities take place under the sponsorship of John Adams High School and carry school credit. Most of the teachers at Adams are young. Students there thoroughly enjoy the chance to have classes in a teacher's home or engage in spontaneous field trips when a matter of particular interest comes up at school.

Adams High School was described in the May 1970 issue of American Education, in an article by John Guernsey, the education reporter on the Portland Oregonian. The last paragraph of this article states that "at 3 p.m. ..... people aren't stampeding one another to check out and leave for the day. Many students and teachers stay until five, six or seven because they're working on something -- or with somebody -- they are interested in." As with Berkeley (West Campus), Adams, even though new, has not been wholly peaceful, but again, in the terms of this report, it is one of the most successful high schools we have seen.

C. UNDERSTANDING AND HONORING CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

The rush of ethnic and racial pride among American minorities has placed a very important task in the hands of those who educate the young. That pride, so necessary to self-respect and personal dignity, must be recognized. Yet educators are not of one mind in the matter.

To our survey proposition, "Administrators should encourage ethnic programs and groups such as black studies or the Chicano student association", almost half (44 percent) agreed and another 27 percent were neutral. The Policy Institute has no pat prescription in this area. We suspect that when and if black studies programs are exclusively for black students or when the material in the black curriculum is strictly black that some very bad history is being reinvented. Essentially all-white curricula, so characteristic of American education for so long, took their heavy tool. On the other hand, student organizations based on ethnic affinity seem, on balance, to be both inevitable and, at least in the short run, constructive of increased ethnic dignity.

Honoring ethnic heroes can be a matter of difficult choice, of course. And, there is always the sarcastic antagonist to this idea who asks, "What about the Laplanders; don't they get their day, too?" The simple point to be made is that where central city high schools contain large numbers of ethnic minorities or even a majority, the usual and traditional celebrations must and should include important representation from those cultures. It might even be said that in all-white, suburban schools similar practices would add a significant dimension to education. Schoolmen who make these kinds of decisions are on ticklish political ground and know it. Heroes to some are traitors or revolutionaries to others.

In the recruiting of staff, it is our predominant judgment that all things being relatively equal, it is a wise policy to promote or recruit a black teacher and/or administrator rather than a white one in a predominately black school.

When asked to comment on this proposition, a full two-thirds of the responding principals agreed, and only 11 percent disagreed. This is a significant change of view from what we remember was the common feeling just a few short years ago when the proud claim was typically, "we are color-blind." Having said this, however, we wish to point out that the Policy Institute staff is not wholly agreed on this important policy matter. There is always the haunting concern that personnel practices of obvious value in the shorter run can become frozen as a long-range tradition which would be detrimental to students, schools, and, indeed, a whole society. "Color-blind" may be inappropriate as we make up for decades of old wrongs. Over the long haul, however, it is the only possible moral stance for a democratic nation.

On the other hand our judgment, after interviewing students, that central city schools should have younger teachers and staff members, was not agreed to by the principals surveyed. Only 23 percent expressed accord and a full 41 percent were neutral. Interestingly enough, the principals' response to a later statement, however, went as follows, "Significant numbers of classroom teachers are no longer effective with the kinds of students now enrolled in our high schools." Over half (52 percent) agreed with this proposition, but from earlier responses they apparently do not relate this to age. Our interviews with students suggest that it should be so related.

We have spoken earlier of the need for official appreciation of varied dress and other social styles. To be sure, there are limits in these matters, but the old imposition of an essentially WASP life style on young people who neither understand nor accept it is happily on the wane. Seemingly small matters can make a large difference. In an integrated high school, a good administration arranges for both a black and a white music group at any dance, for example.

D. ENLARGING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

The Policy Institute was mildly surprised by the principals' responses to three particular questions dealing with student involvement. First, "Are there voting students on a student-conduct policy body at your school?" Half replied "yes" and half replied "no". We had expected that, by now, more central city high schools would have permitted students to vote on a conduct policy body. Second, "Are there voting students on a disciplinary body at your school?" Only 18 percent responded "yes" and 82 percent replied "no". While we view this as a more delicate subject, maybe even involving legalities when students officially participate in the discipline of other students, we had hoped the affirmative replies would be more numerous. Third, "Are there voting students on a curriculum committee at your school?" Twenty percent said there were, and 80 percent said there were not. We are surprised that a full one-fifth so responded in the affirmative. In our visits to the 27 high schools, we had found very few students officially participating on curricula bodies and considerable hesitation as to how best to involve students in course construction.

Again, we were especially concerned that half of the principals had responded "no" to the presence of students on a conduct-policy body. It is one thing to be a bit chary about allowing students to participate in specific punishment of specific other students. It seems almost obsolete to refuse to allow students to participate meaningfully in the actual formation of conduct policy.

A corollary issue regarding student involvement is the matter of grade requirements for participation in athletics, student government, cheerleading, and other extracurricular activities. We referred to this matter earlier in Part III and pointed out that whatever its rationale, it often tended to create less proportionate participation by the various minority groups in a school. We then pointed out that this result was often labeled racist or discriminatory by minority group students. Our questionnaire showed that urban schools still employ grade requirements to a substantial degree. To our question, "Do you have minimum grade requirements for student participation in athletics?", 90 percent of the principals replied "yes". In student government? 65 percent replied "yes". In cheerleading squads? 81 percent replied "yes". In other extracurricular activities? 47 percent replied "yes". We suspect that there are complicated reasons for the tenacity of these requirements, but if one of them is based on the notion that low-mark students would be studying rather than practicing with the cheerleader squad, we wonder about the extent and validity of supporting evidence.

E. ENGAGEMENT OF A SCHOOL'S "NATURAL COMMUNITY"

A basic conclusion of this report is that a community which does not feel it has effective ways to make use of the high stakes it has in its school will surely treat that school in a negative way and it will be a generally unhappy institution. This is not a startling new conclusion, of course, but in the 1970's the methods used to implement this principle must be substantially different and more varied than was the case in the past. As one principal told us, "The old PTA syndrome is a strictly middle class, volunteer machinery which we cannot use."

There are many ways to meaningfully engage a school's constituency. Among these are:

2-

1. Standing (not ad hoc) crises groups consisting of school staff, students, teachers, community leaders, and parents. Urban schools should work very hard to avoid the charge, commonly made by thoughtful and active parents, "you only call us in when there is big trouble." Disrupted colleges and universities have learned that efforts to build, encourage, sustain, and meaningfully employ such a standing group prior to a crunch have been enormously worthwhile. In this context, the Policy Institute research staff was almost dismayed when only 30 percent of the urban principals surveyed by questionnaires answered "yes" to the following questions, "Do you have an established, standing crisis-group at your school in contrast to ad hoc crisis groups?"

2. Non-academic Outreach Personnel

In our judgment, it is not yet common enough in the urban schools to find trained, paid "community agents" or social workers who are a regular part of a high school's staff. (Only 25 percent of the principals said that they had such assistance.) One city, Portland, Oregon, has used community agents regularly for several years and with considerable success. These liaison people can serve as a facile link between community and school -- being both the eyes and ears that can transmit signals in both directions.

We are quick to point out that social workers on school staffs are not always welcome. They add yet one more perspective and one more person in the complicated and often delicate relationships between a school's academic staff and parents. On balance, however, it is our opinion that such a perspective is needed more often than not.

3. Paid, Neighborhood-based Security Aides at the School

Reference was made to successful use of this device earlier at Berkeley (West Campus). Another excellent example was found at East High School in

Cleveland where the "hall guards" are also community people, some mothers, some fathers, whose children are in the school. Our staff reported that students there told them that they did not want to be embarrassed by being caught doing something by somebody they knew and who knew their older brother, or who knew their mother or father. It seems obvious to point out that when such a security aide tells a student to "cool it", the response is likely to be more positive than if the enforcer were a uniformed policeman who had been on that beat for only three months and had come from a different part of town.

We realize that there can be important complications in the use of such security aides. Exactly which police powers should they be given? Can they detain and, in affect, arrest? No one disputes the power of school officials to control conduct in the schools, but such powers are limited by fundamental constitutional safeguards. Security aides must be carefully trained in what those safeguards are.

4. Para/professionals

Since the first thrust of the community action program of the war on poverty, there has been a widespread use of neighborhood non-professionals in school administration. They have occupied a vast variety of roles: assistance in the school nurse's office, study hall monitoring, aides in athletics and other extracurricular activities, and so on. This development in American society we deem to be healthy. Our observations lead us to the conclusion that it contributes substantially to enlarging the linkage between a school and its natural community.

5. Community Ombudsman or Advocate

One of the most perplexing issues for thoughtful schoolmen is how to respond to a wide range of pressures for more formalized arrangements between a school and its sending constituency. As indicated earlier, the old volunteer PTA structure seems wanting.

A full 75 percent of principals surveyed by questionnaire replied in the affirmative to the question, "Do you think there should be some kind of 'community advocate' system to better relate a community to its school?" Obviously, the need for this kind of function is felt strongly. On the other hand it is difficult to engineer such a role. How would such a person or persons be selected? Should he be paid (he should, in our view) and, if so, by whom? Our best judgment is that a true advocate should not be on the school system payroll but should be a person from such parallel institutions as a neighborhood community action agency or model cities organization, funded in part by federal and local government or by private solicitation. We realize the inherent problem in determining precisely for whom an advocate or advocates speak, but we feel school systems should experiment with a variety of ways to meet what is clearly a felt need.

6. Decentralization

So much has been said and written about this matter over recent years that it is not necessary to chronicle the story here. New York City has created 31 community school districts largely governed by newly elected local school boards in an effort to bring the schools closer to their constituents. At this writing, those local boards are still waiting for their specific authority to be spelled out by the central Board of Education.

In Detroit, a new plan just approved by the Michigan legislature calls for eight local school districts and a central board of education with 13 members. The significant feature in Detroit is that a majority of the central board members will come from the eight local boards.

The Policy Institute has no specific prescription for the particular form decentralization should take. There are many subtleties in such arrangements. For example, is it absolutely necessary that a local board have the legal power to appoint principals within its district in order to have adequate influence over key school matters? What if local boards were officially and publicly called upon to make advisory judgments on a list of central board nominees for principalships in a local board's jurisdiction? This, too, would be substantial power, and in our judgment, almost equal to the legal authority to appoint. It also might be a way to steer clear of contrary state statutes. Whatever the arrangements, it seems clear by now that large city school systems must develop meaningful and publicized ways in which the distance and impersonality of the "downtown board" is dissipated.

F. PRINCIPAL STYLES AND COMMUNICATION

It would come as no surprise to any high school principal when we report that he is the proverbial man-in-the-middle. He is responsible for the daily success of a very volatile institution, while above and around him are a welter of pressures rarely in concert. Today's principal knows that the old-style authoritarian, sitting back in his office making judgments, issuing ukases, and disciplining both student and staff, is obsolete. Where such persons are still in office, and we saw two or three, the results are simply disastrous.

The striking characteristic of the life-style of a good principal in recent years is the staggering amounts of time that he must now spend personally relating to enormous numbers of people and constituencies. No longer will the written memo or the notice on the bulletin board suffice. One principal, obviously competent and obviously very tired, put it succinctly, "I have an endless number of face-to-face, one-to-one relationships. They never stop. And I want to be warm, sincere, and sharp for every one of them. There are only 24 hours in any day, and I am really pooped. Can't you get me a grant to go off and study something somewhere?"

The Man cannot be everywhere, all the time, both inside and outside his school. Yet the role of this public official, as with so many others in the last decade, has become one of public relations in the best sense of the words. Particularly in poverty communities he cannot be "represented" by lesser officials whether the dialogue is between community groups and his school, or students and their school. He must have a range of special abilities not common to every man. He must be a very good listener. He must be slow to react to vilification, obscene epithets, or other verbal assaults on his person. He must produce repeated, frequent proof to students and his school's community that his administration is really working on the problems they all have -- not co-opting students and parents or, worse, duping them. The one kind of administrator or teacher that city youngsters can spot quickly and clearly is the fake. The principal must genuinely possess and repeatedly show his respect for students and staff as people. And, he must have that special ability to truly convince his clients, whether staff, student or community, that no school can do everything but that his administration wants to make the very best of its limited personnel and financial resources.

As with other public executives, his prime task is conflict management and he knows it. To our survey question, "Should there be more in-service training about conflict management for topside school administrators?" Ninety percent agreed, eight percent were neutral, and only two percent disagreed.

The Policy Institute staff consulted, observed, or formally questioned hundreds of high school principals during the past four months. From their generous gifts of time and insight we have abstracted the following suggestions for principals regarding school disruption:

1. Remember that disruptive events are rarely carefully planned or programmed. Disruption is triggered often by the smallest, apparently insignificant occurrence. The issue is not so much how the trigger was pulled. The best principals work very hard to create a whole school setting where the probability of an explosion is low but, should one come, careful preparations have been made in advance.

2. Know potential disrupters personally and develop a "feel" for how each one might respond in a tense situation.

3. Work very hard to obtain official authority to deviate from conventional administrative guidelines and practices should an unconventional disruptive situation arise. At the same time, show care that such deviation does not set a contagious precedent. Above all, maintain a professional bearing throughout a disruptive event. If a disrupting group, whether student, community, or a mix of both, senses that the prime authority figure is rattled, the group will undoubtedly increase its "successful" disturbance.

4. Lastly, take some comfort in John F. Kennedy's felicitous phrase, "Just because there's a problem doesn't mean there's a solution."

* * *

Here then are some of the practices observed, some of the successful attitudes and strategems recorded. We wish that out of our investigations some kind of fool-proof gadgetry had emerged. It has not. Ultimately, we are thrown back to elemental judgments about the larger and more pervasive forces in the society -- forces that must somehow be tamed before school behavior can be tamed. In the meantime, in proximate situations, we are increasingly convinced of the wisdom of Mathew Arnold's admonition of a century ago: "When will people learn that it is the spirit we are of, and not the machinery we employ, that binds us to others?"

The logic of our findings for policy-making at higher levels of government seems obvious:

A. Continue every investment in the relief of the poverty and historic injustice which are at the root of so many secondary school disruption problems.

B. Support and expand the kind of in-service training of schoolmen in conflict resolution that has been pioneered by Mark Chesler and his group at the University of Michigan.

C. Disseminate widely, but particularly within all elements of the education community, the literature and documents which portray the deep complexity of school disruption so that at least some of the current apprehension and dissatisfaction about urban schools as troubled institutions can be reduced.

D. Increase the investment in public programs such as Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act by which integrating schools can be further assisted in managing race-related tension and disruption.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSAL

APPENDIX A

Proposal # 1-2U023I 3/27/70

School Disruption Study

I. Summary

II. Rationale

III. Scope

IV. Schedule of Work and Reports

V. Explanatory Notes

VI. Principal Investigators

Attachments - A) Budget

B) Draft of Site-Visit Instrument

Syracuse University Research Corporation
Policy Institute, Stephen K. Bailey
Chairman
723 University Avenue
Syracuse, New York

315-477-8688

School Disruption Study

I. Summary

We propose to make an in-depth analysis of approximately 25 integrated American intermediate and secondary schools located in representative cities in the adjacent 48 states. The focus of the study would center on two fundamental questions: 1) What are the causes and effects of disruption? and 2) What strategies are used to try to minimize disruption? We will be emphasizing the latter question rather than catalog yet one more list of horror stories.

II. Rationale

If the rash of current reports on interracial conflict in American secondary schools is only half true, there exists a fundamental threat to the success of school integration and even to the very education of adolescents in America. The list of incidents, large and small, need not be repeated here. Fear and tension, often unarticulated and usually unpublished, pervade a large number of these schools and show no signs of abating. And, as the courts press for further and more immediate integration, north as well as south, the issue will become even more serious.

It is time for an analysis of the problem and a series of recommendations as to how to reduce it.

III. Scope

a. 25 Schools, Intermediate or Secondary.

b. Public Schools

c. Nationwide. (See list of cities in budget attachment)

d. Integrated: Schools which approach 5% black or more, or/ where a school is virtually all black, if approximately 50% of its faculty are white, this form of integration would be included also.

e. "School" means all direct parties to its existence - parents, teachers, administrators, system officials, students, community organizations, community opinion formers or transmitters, local press, other functionaries such as police, churchmen, etc.

f. Interdisciplinary research, using talents in Syracuse University from its Law School, Department of Social Psychology, School of Education, Maxwell School of Public Affairs, Upstate Medical Center, and Urban Teacher Preparation Program.

IV. Schedule of Work and Reports

April 1 - 10

A. Define "disruption" as behavior which interrupts the educational process - running from outright violence to mere "unruliness" to more subtle fear-producing features such as extortion and intimidation.

B. Survey the literature on the subject, both "educational" literature and the wider realm of research on social conflict, particularly among adolescents.

Staff to construct appropriate field interview and research schedule so as to produce comparable inputs for both running reports and general reports. Convene advisory panel of professionals with wide experience in social research to review and revise interview schedules.

April 11 - June 11

C. Arrange 5-day, two-man visits to each of 25 schools, selected for their regional distribution and because staff in the Policy Institute have personal access to those schools for one experiential reason or another. At such school settings, teams would discuss disruption with people from all "constituencies" described in the definition of "school" in III e. above.

Access to significant and accurate information is crucial. Depending upon the personal contacts in each setting, team members would use a variety of methods to obtain access. Upon completion of a site-visit, members will prepare a raw report at once.

June 12 - 30

D. Prepare comprehensive summary report to HEW, including recommended future analysis and/or demonstration.

REPORTS:

a. One Interim Report dated May 15, 1970

b. One Final Report dated June 30, 1970

c. Copies of A + B to Dr. Mark Chesler, Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

V. Explanatory Notes:

A. We pledge cooperation with efforts to submit a mail questionnaire from organizations other than the Policy Institute of Syracuse. Should USOE develop its current plans to seek a further mail questionnaire study by organizations such as the Association of School Principals and/or the Council of Great Cities, Syracuse would provide every possible assistance in the construction of such questionnaires during the latter part of April, 1970 at no increased cost.

If the questionnaires are constructed and a wide poll taken, Syracuse stands ready to provide the data management time and talent needed to collate and report on the results to HEW. Presumably this could be done in June, 1970. Costs for this added service are included in the attached budget. At this stage, with no questionnaire yet prepared, we determined costs on the following basis:

1. 30,000 secondary schools in the U.S.
2. Questionnaire to 5% = 1500
3. Estimate 100 items per questionnaire.
4. Return rate approximately 50% - 750
5. Report to HEW

B. We expect that the inclusion of a rental car for each of the two site-visitors could seem extravagent. Our experience is, however, that "visits to schools", as such, simply does not uncover the intelligence and information needed to fully understand the complex nature of disruption. Frequently our team would not operate as a pair. They do profit from a joint site-visit back in a hotel room where notes can be compared and gaps in local information filled in. The use of two cars, for two researchers, talking to different persons, in different places simultaneously, is advisable and productive when needed.

C. An advisory panel of mostly Syracuse people is deemed important to the investigation. There are a number of persons at the University and in the city who have had lengthy experience in adolescent behavior problems, particularly as they pertain to schools. We plan to convene such a panel twice - once midway through the study when about 10-15 site-visit reports are in and again after all are in before a report goes to HEW. At each such session, all field researchers will be called in to the city to join these discussions.

D. In the budget we have also provided for 30 man-days of consulting. This provision accommodates two needs we have felt in the past in such investigations. First, it is often useful to put on a local, younger person who can talk with students easily and report back verbally as to his impressions and information. We feel we should pay for this service even though the person is only a college student in a city where we are doing our research, or even a high school dropout. Secondly, it is often helpful to check our views in a locality with an adult from that locality who holds a fairly neutral post, for example, as the Education Chairman of an Urban League office or an NAACP organization. Again, it is time researchers paid for this service rather than borrow it once again - with no respectful consideration.

E. There could easily be some concern as to the validity of our sample of 25 high schools. We make no statistical claim in conventional terms. We have selected these cities and these schools because we have some facile access to them, and access is crucial if the real facts are going to be uncovered. We are confident that the range of pathologies now harassing the secondary schools will be adequately addressed in the aggregate of these 25 schools.

As to the sample of school persons receiving the mail questionnaire, we would invoke the talents here at the University who have had wide experience in sampling. Access is not the key factor in a mail questionnaire.

F. We wish to state at the outset that our conclusions on the success or failures of strategies to minimize disruption will be only judgements. What "works" in one context and for X amount of time may not be appropriate to another context or even the same setting at a later time. The state of the art of conflict management calls for a careful listing of strategies without pompous "findings" as to their efficacy. A mere listing would be useful considering the crisis of the schools at this time.

Of course, we plan to report on the considered judgments of others as well as our own. Sensitive observation and careful interviewing should produce useful recommendations aggregated from the experience of a number of persons on the front line of school troubles. We merely wish to make it clear that conclusions and recommendations in this highly volatile subject area cannot, and are not designed, to stand a conventional test of scientific predictability.

IV. Principal Investigators' Vitae

Note: While these vitae are designed to show how we plan to administer this study, all members listed but for Dr. Stephen Bailey will be field researchers.

STEPHEN K. BAILEY, A. B., Hiram College; A.B., A.M., Oxford University; M.A. Ph.D., Harvard University

Stephen K. Bailey is Chairman of the Policy Institute of Syracuse University Research Corporation and Maxwell Professor of Political Science in the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University of which he was Dean from 1961 to 1969. Before joining the Maxwell School in 1959 as Professor of Political Science, Dean Bailey served on the faculties of Hiram College, Wesleyan University, and Princeton University. At Princeton he was William Church Osborn Professor of Public Affairs and Director of the Graduate Program in the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. He has also been a Fulbright Lecturer in American Government at Oxford University.

In addition to his academic and professional activities, Dr. Bailey has been an active participant in public affairs. He is currently a member of the Board of Regents of the State of New York and Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Educational Laboratories (Department of HEW).

FRANK W. RENDER II, B.S., Hampton Institute; M.S., Syracuse University

Formerly, Executive Director Syracuse and Onondaga County Human Rights Commission, Render, 33, has taught at Syracuse University (1966-68), and Albany State (Ga.) (1958-61), Virginia State (1961-66), Onondaga Community (1968-69) and LeMoyne (1969 -) Colleges. He is a frequent lecturer and speaker at colleges and at professional mass media conferences. A native of Cincinnati, he attended schools in Columbus, Ohio, Tallahassee, Fla., and Richmond, Va. He has been Assistant Director, Wall St. Journal Newspaper Fund Journalism Workshop at Savannah State College, (1965); Publicity Chief, Seventh Annual Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Richmond, Va., (1963); General Coordinator, Conference on Mass Media and Race Relations, Syracuse University, (1968); Advisor, National Pre-Alumni Council, United Negro College Fund (1968 - 69); and has also been Consultant and Workship Leader at the Conferences on Welfare and the Press, and Crime and the Press at Syracuse University in 1969 and Statewide Seminar on the Press and Human Relations, Michigan Press Association, Michigan State University, (1969).

Render is a fellow in the Urban Studies Division.

CRAIG BAUMGARTEN, Syracuse University Junior in Political Science

Baumgarten, 20, is a native of Chicago where he directed a community involvement program on the South Side while he was a high school student. While at Syracuse University, he has been assistant director of Projection'70, a tutorial program for inner city youth 1967-68; and creator and director of Program for Education Progress, Black and White in America, a course (with credits) on race relations taught by undergraduates 1969 - 70.

Baumgarten is a research assistant in the Urban Studies Division.

ANDREW B. HAYNES, JR., B.S.E.E., Howard University; M.S.T., Portland State University

A native of Orangeburg, South Carolina, Haynes, 31, attended schools in South Carolina and Virginia, graduating from Armstrong High School in Richmond.

A black man, he is a product of a dual school system and other facets of segregated Southern communities in the 1940's and 1950's. He spent one year at Knoxville College before deciding to enroll in the electrical engineering program at Howard University and become an active black nationalist. He attempted (1959-63) to help redirect the civil rights struggle from a paternalistic to a power movement. He gained much of his experience as an operational racial consultant from this four year engagement with the black nationalists, a relationship he has now terminated.

During the period of 1964-67, he worked in Oregon as an electrical engineer and became involved in social action programs.

In 1965 he became a member of the Albina War on Poverty Committee which was the parent citizen committee for the various Great Society programs, including Model Cities, in Portland, Oregon. From 1964 to 1967 he did encounter research on whites' view of institutional racism. This research was done in Oregon, Washington and Idaho extensively. Beginning in 1964 he lectured on college and university campuses and to private groups on the contextual solutions to racial problems.

Haynes has been enrolled in the Urban Studies program on both the undergraduate and graduate levels at Portland State University and is now studying toward a Ph.D. in Sociology and Computer at Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs.

Haynes is a Junior Fellow in the Urban Studies Division.

ROGER W. MACK, B.A. M.A., San Francisco State College

Mack, 25, completed all of his schooling in San Francisco before enrolling in a Doctor of Social Science program at Syracuse University in 1968. He also taught economics and social science at SFSC (1966-68) and was a faculty member of the Peace Corps training program for Liberia and Venezuela in 1966 and 1967. He has published "Interaction and Social Conflict - a picture in black and white", (Maxwell Review, '69), and is doing research on topics such as "Public Policy and New Towns", "Negro Employment Mobility" and "Life Styles and Social Contact in Central Cities and Suburbs".

Mack is a research assistant in the Urban Studies Division.

THOMAS COVE, A.B. Oberlin 1967; M.R.P. Cornell (expected 1970)

Cove, 24, is a native of Albany, New York, and has lived in various places around New York and New Jersey, including "the City".

At Oberlin, he majored in Government and participated in several field projects concerned with power structure studies of surrounding communities. His senior project investigated the use of the semantic differential in the measurement of meaning. The focus of his planning program at Cornell has been City Planning in its social and political context, and his thesis is a field project involving the Social System Analysis approach to Urban Renewal decisionmaking in Mt. Vernon, New York.

Employment experience includes an Internship with the New York State Office of Planning Coordination, supervisory work in the Monmouth County Planning Board, consultant work with the Architects Renewal Committee in Harlem, and relocation and research with the Urban Renewal Agencies of Mt. Vernon, New York and Huntington, L.I.

At present, Cove is studying Psychology, Communications and Metropolitan Studies in the Ph.D. in Social Sciences Program at Syracuse.

Cove is a research assistant in the Urban Studies Division.

STANLEY HUNTERTON, A.B. Syracuse University, 1970

Hunterton, 21, attended public schools in his native state of New York. He has been executive director of "Project '70 Inc." in Syracuse since 1968. Project '70 is an experimental program in manpower training among hard core unemployed youth. He was also founder and director of a tutorial program for inner city children in Syracuse and has had wide contact with center city youth and their problems.

APPENDIX B

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Heath, Robert W., and Landers, Roy. Interviews with Seven Black High School Students. Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1969, pp. 1-19, 28-43.

   The interviews selected from this collection provide a starting point for understanding at least the effective domain of the school disruption problem. Transcription of these taped interviews was done without editing for language or content, and the "facts", as presented by the students, are not contested.

   For the person involved in urban education on a day to day basis, there is little present in this document that has not been heard before. But, those not personally involved will be as fully exposed (as is possible in print) to the frustrations of being black in a white educational system.

2. Glasser, Ira. Memorandum - A Student Bill of Rights. New York: Unpublished memorandum to the participants in the April 7, 1970 HEW Conference on Student Rights, 1970, 15 pp.

   There is currently much talk about the "rights" of a public school student. Concisely and pointedly Mr. Glasser reviews laws and court decisions, vis-a-vis civil liberties, which are pertinent to those involved in public education. This memorandum goes quickly to the heart of an increasingly important segment of the school disruption problem, and would be of value to the student and his parents, as well as administrators and faculty. The "brass tacks" approach of this document is evident from the beginning, "No one disputes the power of school authorities to prescribe and control conduct in the schools, just as no one disputes the power of legislatures to prescribe and control conduct in the larger society. But in both cases, such powers are limited by the Bill of Rights; no public official may exercise authority that is inconsistent with fundamental constitutional safeguards."

If there is difficulty in obtaining this document, similar information is available in the following articles by Mr. Glasser:

"Schools for Scandal - The Bill of Rights and Public Education." Dayton, Ohio: Otterbein Press, 240 W 5th Street, 1969.

"Student Rights in Public Schools - A brief Guide." New York: The New York Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York, 1970

3. U. S. News and World Report, April 27, 1970. "What Happened to One 'Model' High School: Close-up on Desegration," 4 pp.

This article is a case study of the Horace Mann School in Gary, Indiana. The feeding area for this high school is in flux, and after forty years as the prestige white school in Gary, Horace Mann School is having to deal with the problems of an integrated school in a rapidly changing community. The article offers little in the line of response to this problem, but it does clearly describe the problems of administrators, teachers, and others concerned with the dwindling academic performance of the students and other very real problems attendant to integration by population shifts. For those interested in the inter-dependence of the public schools and their communities this brief article is worthwhile.

4. Morris, Richard T., and Jeffries, Vincent. The White Reaction Study. Los Angeles, California: Institute of Government and Public Affairs, U.C.L.A., 1969, 43 pp.

The reactions of the white community to "disruptions" by black people are an increasingly important policy determinant. Although this study is not concerned with a school disruption per se, many of the findings are of use to those who must understand and deal with the phenomenon of "backlash".

This document is a study of 600 white people, and their thoughts and feelings about the August, 1965 riot in Watts. The population universe encompassed low, middle, and high socioeconomic class whites, from both integrated and nonintegrated sections of the county of Los Angeles.

5. Stern, George G. The Failure of Ideology: An Intergenerational Disturbance. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1969, pp. 37-59.

   Professor Stern's article explores the meaning of the generation gap from the viewpoint of the psychologist. A real problem in education and most probably equal with the "racial gap", the generational schism between teachers and students is discussed with a view toward a responsive policy toward education. Stern's contention is that the failure of any "national ideology" to emerge has generated a "confluence of estrangement" among intellectuals and the young, as well as the blacks.

   With respect to education Stern offers the idea that the student, rather than the subject, become the "integrating center" of the learning process. This article is much in line conceptually with recent attempts at module curriculum design, and should be of special interest to those people who work in theory as well as curriculum development.

6. Green, Thomas F. Post-Secondary Education: 1970-1990. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1969, pp. 59 - 68.

   As an exercise in futuristic "if/then" educational policy projection, this article is most informative. Professor Green discusses the positive possibilities (given the right kind of intervention now) for opening up and diversifying both the learning and the certifying practices of education. Continuing education, as Green sees it, is the key to the presently too formal, rigid, and closed processes of training, accreditation and certification.

   The point and value of this article lie in its description of the ramifications attendant to making responsive and responsible those peripheral bodies (e.g., adult education) that might prosper more without than within the "University". Green develops well the case that if his prescriptions work, the consequences for teacher training will be both positive and revolutionary in character.

7. Dunbar, Ernest. "Trouble: The High School Radicals," *Look Magazine*. Des Moines, Iowa: Cowles Communications, Inc., March 24, 1970.

   This is the world of education, both public and private, as seen through the eyes of five high school and junior high professed radicals. They have each written what they want heard, and the article as a whole speaks for itself. The message is clear, and the positions thoughtful; each in "his own bag" (from hair length to curriculum determination) sets forth his own feeling without proporting to represent anyone else. There is a sophistication in these youths (age 12-17) that would greatly benefit both the educational theorist and the practitioner.

8. Education U.S.A. Special Report. *High School Student Unrest - How to Anticipate Protest, Channel Activism, and Protest Student Rights.* Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1969, 48 pp.

   As an overview, and possibly as a handbook, this document provides quick, simple access to the facts, figures, responses, and limitations involved in dealing with school disruptions. With a problem as varied and complex as school disruption it would be wise for anyone to pick and choose from this general document for adaptation to his own specific needs and locale. However, as a reference manual, this document goes well along toward putting most of the aspects of this problem into a frame of reference which is easy to expand upon. The single best thing about this work is its heavy reliance on the opinions, strategies, and programs of the actual people who have learned to face disruption if not routinely, at least as a fact of life.

9. Johnson, Carroll F., and Usdon, Michael D. *Decentralization and Racial integration*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968, 197 pp.

This document is a compilation of eleven presentations made to a Special Training Institute on Problems of School Desegregation. A wide spectrum of views on the questions of integration, decentralization, community control, and related issues is reproduced and briefly commented on. The thrust of the report is "quality education", its ramifications for the children involved and for the society as a whole, and the views expressed are probably more timely now than when they were given.

10. Hunt, Jane. "Principals Report on Student Protest," American Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October 1969, pp. 4-5.

Jane Hunt is an editor with the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and this brief article contains the results of a survey of member principals. In a few short paragraphs Miss Hunt summarizes the respondents' recommendations for prevention and response most cogently. This article appears in the context of another excellent article, "Trouble in the Schools" by Gregory P. Anrig, in the same issue of American Education.

11. Chesler, Mark A., and Jorgensen, Carl. Crises Intervention in the Schools, II: A Report on a Conference of School Administrators. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center For Research on the Utilization of Scientific knowledge, University of Michigan, 1968, 57 pp.

Dr. Chesler brought together school, and school system officials in an attempt to recall and reconstruct crises situations which had been experienced by the group. Through a pattern of role playing, followed by intensive discussions, many creative programs and responses for handling disruption, as well as a number of "do's and don'ts" have been compiled. This document, as well as the next is, at this writing, not ready for general distribution.

12. Chesler, Mark A., with Jan Franklin and Alan Guskin. (Same as above) April 1969, The Development of Alternative Responses to Interracial and Intergenerational Conflict in Secondary Schools, 145 pp.

This is the largest and most comprehensive of the Center's reports on schools. A detailed review of this document is not possible here. However, in the same vein as the center's other work this report provides a cogent and incisive look at what actually can be done about school disruptions; specifically, the report contains many valuable program recommendations for dealing productively with trouble.

13. Louis Harris Poll, Life Magazine, May 18, 1969.

    Harris has juxtaposed the views of students, parents and teachers on such central matters as "student participation in policy making", topics for class discussion", "discipline", and so on. The very different views held by these three groups brings the problem of schools into sharp relief.

14. Congressional Record, February 23, 1970 (pp. E1178-1180).

    This issue contains the results of an exhaustive survey of high school protests in 1969, conducted by the House Subcommittee on General Education. Questionnaires went out to 29,000 high schools; the responses came from 15,000. The results correlate data such as location, size, ethnic composition, etc., of schools and the presence and kind of disruptive events occurring in the high schools.

15. "Waller High and the Winds of Change," Chicago Tribune Sunday Magazine, April 19, 1970, pp. 34-39.

    An excellent description of a polyglot American high school and its tensions and turmoil in a changing urban society. The great strengths of this school and its community are portrayed as well as the debilitating threats to its viability and success.

16. Racial Confrontation. A Study of the White Plains, New York, Student Boycott, by the Center for Human Relations and Community Studies, New York University, New York City, New York (pp. 71).

An example of a carefully wrought case study on one high school's difficulties over racial matters. The chronology is clear; the informants are candid and helpful; the setting for the analysis is properly wide and includes the whole gamut of inputs, from ideology to the specific facts of the particular disruption. A good document for any principal or school board member who wishes to further his understanding about conflict management.

APPENDIX C

CITIES VISITED

APPENDIX C

List of Cities

Atlanta, Georgia

Berkeley, California

Boston, Massachusetts

Denver, Colorado

Chicago, Illinois

Cleveland, Ohio

Dallas, Texas

Detroit, Michigan

Jackson, Mississippi

Los Angeles, California

Oakland, California

Nashville, Tennessee

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Portland, Oregon

San Francisco, California

Seattle, Washington

Syracuse, New York

Winston-Salem, North Carolina

APPENDIX D

SITE-VISIT REPORT OUTLINE

APPENDIX D

City ____________

SITE VISIT REPORT OUTLINE

1. Name of School ____________

2. Address of School ____________

____

3. School Telephone # ____________

4. No. of Students ______

% - Black ______

- White ______

- Spanish Speaking ___

- Oriental ______

- Other ______

5. No. of Staff ______

% - Black ______

- White ______

- Spanish Speaking ___

- Oriental ______

- Other ______

Site Visitor(s) ____________

Dates on the site ____________

Types of people consulted and No.:

Staff - admin. ____________

Teachers ____________

Students ____________

Parents ____________

Community ____________

Police ____________

System ____________

Other ____________

6. Special Basic Characteristics of school, if any; e.g. "just converted to all 9th grade" or "changed last year to Special Center for Vocational ed."

etc. etc. or "due to be closed next year" etc., or "80% of black students here are bussed in", etc.

7. Overall Summary of "Scene":

(Stable, turmoil, tired, tense, etc. etc. etc. poor leadership, good leadership, areas of tension, violence level etc. etc. etc.)

8. Names of knowledgeable persons about this scene and telephone #'s or how to reach them.

9. Particular Disruption History at this school (in the past 3 years)

   - type(s)
   - duration(s)
   - issues
   - "resolution" or outcome(s)

10. (A) Disruption Causes:

    (B) What is being done about them:

    (C) What ought to be done:

As Perceived By:

1. Administrators
2. Teaching faculty
3. Students (current or former)
4. Parents
5. Other community people related to school in any way
6. Other officials, such as police
7. Local press
8. Other

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE
AND
QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Appendix E

DISRUPTION IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS:
THE VIEWS OF URBAN HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

A Summary of the Results of a Survey
Conducted by
The Institute for Community Psychology
Syracuse University

July, 1970

Evaluation Coordinator	- David Sherrill
Project Director	- Robert Cohen
Research Assistants	- Joan Humberger
	- Dennis Angellini
Secretary	- Jean Allen

HIGH SCHOOL DISRUPTION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR
SECONDARY HIGH SCHOOL
PRINCIPALS

June 1970

DIRECTIONS

In the space labeled "NAME" on the answer sheet write the name of the city in which your school is located. Do not put your name on the answer sheet. Your responses will be anonymous. Data are to be analyzed by groups, not by individuals.

Respond to each of the following questions by darkening the appropriate space [(a), (b), (c), (d), or (e)] on the enclosed answer sheet. Where yes or no is required, use (a) for yes and (b) for no. Please answer all questions. If you are uncertain of the exact answer, chose the closest alternative. USE PENCIL ONLY. Make all marks heavy and dark. Erase completely any mark you wish to change.

Please do not fold the answer sheet and return it using the enclosed, postage paid envelope as soon as possible and no later than July 15.

---

1. What is the approximate population of your city (if less than 50,000, leave answer space blank)? (a) 50,000-99,999 (b) 100,000-299,999 (c) 300,000-699,999 (d) 700,000-1,500,000 (e) more than 1,500,000
2. How many students are enrolled at your school? (a) 0-499 (b) 500-999 (c) 1000-1999 (d) 2000-3000 (e) more than 3000

For questions 3-7, estimate the percentage of students at your school which falls into the given ethnic category.

3. Black (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%
4. White (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%
5. Spanish Speaking (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%
6. Oriental (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%
7. Other (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%

8. What is the size of your staff (if less than 25, leave answer space blank)? (a) 25-49 (b) 50-99 (c) 100-149 (d) 150-200 (e) greater than 200

For questions 9-13, estimate the percentage of your staff which falls into the given ethnic category.

9. Black (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%
10. White (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%
11. Spanish Speaking (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%
12. Oriental (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%
13. Other (a) less than 5% (b) 6%-25% (c) 26%-49% (d) 50%-90% (e) more than 90%

Have any of the following events occurred in your school during the past three years? If no, indicate by selecting (a). If yes, indicate to what extent each was caused by racial conflict by selecting (b), (c) or (d).

14. Teacher boycott, walkout, or strike (a) did not occur (b) no racial basis (c) somewhat racial (d) substantial racial basis
15. Student boycott, walkout, or strike (a) did not occur (b) no racial basis (c) somewhat racial (d) substantial racial basis
16. Arson (a) did not occur (b) no racial basis (c) somewhat racial (d) substantial racial basis
17. Property damage other than arson (a) did not occur (b) no racial basis (c) somewhat racial (d) substantial racial basis
18. Rioting (a) did not occur (b) no racial basis (c) somewhat racial (d) substantial racial basis
19. Student-teacher physical confrontation (a) did not occur (b) no racial basis (c) somewhat racial (d) substantial racial basis
20. Picketing or parading (a) did not occur (b) no racial basis (c) somewhat racial (d) substantial racial basis
21. Presence on campus of unruly, unauthorized, non-school persons (a) did not occur (b) no racial basis (c) somewhat racial (d) substantial racial basis
22. Abnormal unruliness among students (a) did not occur (b) no racial basis (c) somewhat racial (d) substantial racial basis

If something unusual other than the events above (14-22) occurred, please give details on the back of the answer sheet. Indicate the extent to which this event resulted in increased racial conflict.

To what extent did the events you checked above (14-22) result in increased racial conflict at your school?

23. Teacher boycott, walkout, or strike (a) did not occur (b) no increase (c) some increase (d) substantial increase
24. Student boycott, walkout, or strike (a) did not occur (b) no increase (c) some increase (d) substantial increase
25. Arson (a) did not occur (b) no increase (c) some increase (d) substantial increase
26. Property damage other than arson (a) did not occur (b) no increase (c) some increase (d) substantial increase
27. Rioting (a) did not occur (b) no increase (c) some increase (d) substantial increase
28. Student-teacher physical Confrontation (a) did not occur (b) no increase (c) some increase (d) substantial increase
29. Picketing or parading (a) did not occur (b) no increase (c) some increase (d) substantial increase
30. Presence on campus of unruly, unauthorized, non-school persons (a) did not occur (b) no increase (c) some increase (d) substantial increase
31. Abnormal unruliness among students (a) did not occur (b) no increase (c) some increase (d) substantial increase

The following series of questions deals with strategies of coping with potential or actual school disruption. (We realize that the following items in no way cover a comprehensive list of such strategies. These were selected from a series of site-visit reports from high schools. Your replies will help us fill in some gaps in our current information.)

32. Which of the following may suspend a student at this school?
(a) Principal (b) Vice Principal (c) Both (d) Neither
33. Which of the following may suspend a student at this school?
(a) Teacher (b) Hall Guard (Monitor, etc.) (c) Both (d) Neither
34. Which of the following may expel a student at this school?
(a) Principal (b) Vice Principal (c) Both (d) Neither
35. Which of the following may expel a student at this school?
(a) Teacher (b) Hall Guard (Monitor, etc.) (c) Both (d) Neither
36. Must a suspended student bring a parent or other adult to school in order to be reinstated?
(a) Yes (b) No

37. Must an expelled student bring a parent or other adult to school in order to be reinstated? (a) Yes (b) No
38. Do you have a kind of "detention" area in school to which you can send an unruly student? (a) Yes (b) No
39. Do you invoke older members of a student's family to help discipline him or her? (a) Yes (b) No
40. Do you permit parents to visit in-progress classes? (a) Yes (b) No
41. Do you have school-paid community liaison people (such as a "Community Agent") on your staff? (a) Yes (b) No
42. Do you as principal personally have an "open door policy," that is, do you have time for this? (a) Yes (b) No
43. Do you usually hold parents or other adults responsible for any property damage caused by a student? (a) Yes (b) No
44. Does your district have a staff tactical group available to you should your campus be disrupted? (a) Yes (b) No
45. Do you use "T groups" or sensitivity training in working with your staff and/or students? (a) Yes (b) No
46. Do you have an established, standing crisis-group at your school (such as a Parent-Teacher Council) in contrast to an ad hoc crisis group(s) at your school? (a) Yes (b) No
47. Do you have uniformed police in your building(s) (a) never (b) only on call (c) regularly
48. Do you have non-uniformed police in your building(s) (a) never (b) only on call (c) regularly

Do you have any of the following non-police, non-faculty, security personnel in your school:
49. Community adults? (a) Yes (b) No
50. Parents? (a) Yes (b) No
51. Older siblings? (a) Yes (b) No
52. Other students? (a) Yes (b) No
53. School system security persons? (a) Yes (b) No
54. Are your school doors locked during school hours? (a) Yes (b) No
55. Has it been necessary to frisk and/or search students (a) Yes (b) No
56. Have you found it necessary to search lockers, etc.? (a) Yes (b) No
57. How many counselors do you have (if none, leave answer space Blank)?
(a) 1-3 (b) 4-7 (c) 8-11 (d) 12-15 (e) over 15
58. What is your average daily attendance?
(a) 90%-100% (b) 80%-89% (c) 70%-79% (d) 60%-69% (e) less than 60%
59. Do you have a mechanism for student government which would insure proportional representation of the major ethnic components of your student body?
(a) Yes (b) No (If yes, please describe on back of answer sheet)
60. Are there voting students on a curriculum committee at your school? (a) Yes (b) No
61. Are there voting students on a disciplinary body at your school? (a) Yes (b) No
62. Are there voting students on a student conduct policy body at your school? (a) Yes (b) No

Do you have minimum grade requirements for student participation
63. in athletics? (a) Yes (b) No
64. in student government? (a) Yes (b) No
65. in cheerleading squad? (a) Yes (b) No
66. in other extra curricular activities (a) Yes (b) No

67. To what extent does the physical layout of your school contribute to disruption (dark areas, stairway arrangements, etc.)?
(a) very little (b) somewhat (c) to an average degree (d) to a great degree
68. Have you participated in re-arranging school boundaries so as to alter particularly disruptive social mixes? (a) Yes (b) No
69. Have you physically partitioned off or otherwise cut down large spaces within school boundaries which could lead to unruly gatherings? (a) Yes (b) No
70. In your judgment, how adequate is your informal access to information about possible student disruption? (a) inadequate (b) fair (c) good (d) excellent

71. In your experience, has your informal access to information averted serious trouble? (leave answer space blank if you have no informal access to information).
(a) rarely (b) occasionally (c) often

72. How difficult is it for you to transfer a tenured teacher who is no longer appropriate to the current conditions at your school?
(a) not too difficult (b) difficult (c) very difficult

73. Do you have discretionary dollars available to you which enable you to respond quickly to important controversies? (a) Yes (b) No

74. Do you feel your discretionary authority to respond to trouble is adequate (a) Yes (b) No

75. Do you have a policy of minimal response to the press should they inquire of you about disruptive activity at your school? (a) Yes (b) No

76. What percentage of your students work part-time on or off campus for wages?
(a) 0%-19% (b) 20%-39% (c) 40%-59% (d) 60%-79% (e) 80%-100%

77. What percentage of your students work full-time as well as go to high school?
(a) 0%-9% (b) 10%-19% (c) 20%-29% (d) 30%-39% (e) more than than 40%

The remaining items in this questionnaire are a series of propositions related to high school disruption. From your experience and judgments, would you please record the extent of your personal agreement or disagreement with each proposition in terms of the following:

(a) strongly agree
(b) agree
(c) neither agree nor disagree
(d) disagree
(e) strongly disagree

78. When disruption occurs, the process and style one uses to respond to it is less important than the substance of one's response.

79. There should be more in-service training about conflict management for topside school administrators.

80. Teacher recruitment and criteria for selection should be wider and more varied.

81. There should be some kind of "community advocate" system to better relate a community to its school.

82. When disruption occurs, it is often wiser to just "ride it out" rather than get into anxious negotiations and meetings.

83. Administrators should not encourage ethnic programs and groups such as Black Studies or the Chicano Student Association.

84. Schools in low-income settings should have younger teachers and staff members.

85. Press coverage of school trouble is rarely helpful.

86. Students who work full or part-time are more likely to engage in disruptive activity than those who do not work.

87. A regular "rap session" between students and principal (once or twice per week) is helpful in reducing the chances of disruption.

88. There can be too much dialogue between principal and students; sometimes it is better not to talk.

89. All things being relatively equal, it is a wise policy to promote or recruit a black teacher/administrator before a white one in a predominately black school.

90. Vista Volunteers and Teacher Corps type personnel, used on a regular basis, help keep the permanent faculty "up to date" and responsive.

91. When districts bus significant numbers of students, in whatever direction and however far or near, this often creates racial, ethnic, or income differences which produce disruption.

92. The mere presence of uniformed police inside a school building is often a cause rather than a deterent of school disruption.

93. Continuing college disruption and the great publicity about it is a major cause of high school disruption.

94. Pressure on students from various political outsiders is a major cause of disruption in city schools.

95. "Underground" student newspapers or flyers are significant causes of school disruption.
96. Teacher unions or associations often resist school changes which could reduce disruptions.
97. Whatever the noise created by a minority of restless students, a school typically has a substantial majority which is loyal to the school and will not disrupt it.
98. A major cause of student unrest is frustration caused by hasty career and program guidance counseling.
99. Significant numbers of classroom teachers are no longer effective with the kinds of students now enrolled in our high schools.
100. A school is essentially a receptacle for a large number of difficult societal conflicts it has not created.
101. There is a good deal of pessimism, even numbness, among teachers with respect to the notion that city schools will ever be really free from disruption in the next decade.
102. I, as a principal, share the above pessimism. (I do not think city schools will be really free from disruption during the next decade.)

Biographic Data

103. Please indicate your own ethnic origin: (a) Black (b) White (c) Spanish-Speaking (d) Oriental (e) Other
104. How many years have you been a principal? (a) less than 1 (b) 1-2 (c) 3-5 (d) 6-10 (e) more than 10
105. What is your sex (a) Male (b) Female
106. What is your age? (a) less than 30 (b) 30-35 (c) 36-40 (d) 41-50 (e) over 50

Table of Contents

Page(s)

INTRODUCTION....................E- 1

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS RELATIVE TO THE ANALYSES AND STATISTICS...E- 2,3

I DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS....................E- 4

Table 3 Rate of Response to the High School Disruption Questionnaire by Regions....................E- 5

Table 4 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the High School Disruption Questionnaire ....E- 6

Table 5 A Comparison of the Ethnicity of School Staffs and Student Bodies....................E- 7

Table 6 A Regional Comparison of the Ethnicity of School Staffs and Student Bodies....................E- 8

Table 7 Black Student Enrollment in Schools Which Have Predominantly Black Staffs....................E- 9

II SUMMARIES OF REPORTED DISRUPTION IN TERMS OF VARIOUS SUBGROUPS..E-10

Table 8 A Summary of Disruption in Terms of Ethnic Compatibility of Student Body and Staff....................E-11,12

Table 9 A Profile of Disruption in Terms of Ethnicity of Staff....E-13

Table 10 Percent of Schools with Over 90% Black Enrollment Which Reported No Disruption....................E-14

Table 11 A Profile of Disruption Based on Size of Student Body.....E-15

Table 12 A Profile of Disruption in Terms of Black Student Enrollment....................E-16

Table 13 A Profile of Disruption in Terms of Principals'Experience.E-17

III RELATEDNESS OF DISRUPTION AND SPECIFIC SURVEY ITEMS.............E-18

Table 14 Correlations between Various Forms of Disruption and Other Specific Items (N=683)....................E-19,20

IV STRATEGIES FOR COPING WITH DISRUPTION....................E-21

Table 15 Strategies for Coping with Disruption: A Regional Comparison....................E-22

Page(s)

V COMPARISONS OF VARIOUS PROPOSITIONS AND THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DERIVED FACTORS AND SPECIFIC ITEMS........................E-23

Table 16 The Average Response to Each of 25 Propositions Relative to High School Disruption (N=683)..........................E-24,25

Table 17 Division of the 25 Propostions of the High School Disruption Questionnaire into Common Factors....................E-26,27

Table 18 Correlations between the Seven Derived Factors and Specific Disruption Items (N=683)..........................E-28,29

VI COMPARISONS OF FACTOR AND ITEM RESPONSES ACROSS VARIOUS SUBGROUPS..E-30

Table 19 A Comparison of Selected Responses of Principals Grouped by Geographic Regions......................................E-31

Table 20 A Comparison of Selected Responses of Principals Who Reported Some Form of Disruption (N=577) and Those Who Reported No Disruption (N=106)...........................E-32

Table 21 A Comparison of Responses of the Black Principals (N=63) and the White Principals (N=602)........................E-33

Table 22 A Comparison of Selected Responses of Black (N=63) and White (N=602) Principals...............................E-34,35

Table 23 A Comparison of Selected Responses of Principals Grouped in Terms of Reported Average Daily Attendance............E-36

Table 24 A Comparison of Selected Responses of Principals Grouped in Terms of Reported Access to Information Relative to Disruption..E-37

Table 25 Observations Relative to Years of Experience.............E-38

Table 26 Observations of Schools Which Use Uniformed Police on a Regular Basis..E-39

VII A SUMMARY OF ALL RESPONSES....................................E-40

Table 27 A Summary of Responses to All Items:Total Sample(N=683)...E-41,42

Introduction

The Institute for Community Psychology of Syracuse University, under contract with The Policy Institute of Syracuse University Research Corporation, carried out a survey on high school disruption.

Between July 2 and 7, 1970, 1962 questionnaires were mailed to principals of high schools which had a student enrollment of more than 750 and were located in a metropolitan area of more than 50,000 people. The questionnaire consisted of 106 questions and was divided into several sections:

Demographic information (13 items);
Delineation of various disorders (9 items);
Degree to which the disorders relate to racial tension (9 items);
Series of strategies for coping with disorder (46 items);
Series of propositions relevant to disruption (25 items); and
Biographic information (3 items).

A cover letter, answer sheet and return, self-addressed, stamped envelope were included with the questionnaire.

Analysis of the data began July 20 when 683 answer sheets had been received; data received after this date were not included in the analysis. Analyses were in terms of comparisons of percentages which represented the degree to which various alternatives were endorsed; correlations between various items; and, comparisons of group mean responses for various subgroups in terms of F and t statistics. Results are grouped as follows:

I. Demographic characteristics of the respondents
II. Summaries of reported disruption in terms of various subgroups
III. Relatedness of disruption and specific survey items
IV. Strategies for coping with disruption
V. Comparisons of various propositions and the relationships between derived factors and specific items
VI. Comparisons of factor and item responses across various subgroups
VII. A summary of all responses to all items and a comparison of item responses of black and white principals

Some General Observations Relative to the Analyses and Statistics Presented in the Following Tables

1. For all tables which contain percentages:

   Values within any given category will not necessarily sum to 100% because of omissions made by respondents.

2. Factor Solutions:

   Factors 1-6 are the result of the factor analysis of the responses of 683 principals to items 78-102. A principal axis solution was determined and the extracted factors were rotated to orthogonality (Varimax). Of the eight factors extracted, six were deemed interpretable (See Table 17).

   Factor 7 was derived from an image analysis of the responses of the 683 principals. The matrix of item covariances (as opposed to item correlations) was factored. Only one factor was determined and it was shown to be based on 9 of the 25 items.

   For both factor and image analyses, factor extraction was limited by an eigenvalue cut-off of 1.00.

3. Factor Scores:

   All factor scores were derived by the application of factor score weights based on item loadings to item raw scores (original responses). Scores have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of 1.00. The range of scores is typically +3.00 to -3.00. Factor scores are distributed in much the same fashion as Z scores and can be interpreted as such. Based on responses to items 78-102, scores on the seven factors were determined for each principal.

4. Interpreting Factor Scores:

   Factor 1: The more positive the score, the less passive the response to disruption. (Principals who score low on Factor 1 endorse a "ride it out" philosophy.)

   Factor 2: The more positive the score, the less the concern for preventive training programs.

   Factor 3: The more positive the score, the more pessimistic the respondent.

   Factor 4: The more positive the score, the greater the blame projected onto internal, nonadministrative elements.

   Factor 5: The more positive the score, the less prone to acquiescence the respondent. (An individual with a low score tends to make the more socially desirable responses.)

   Factor 6: The more positive the score, the greater the blame projected onto external, nonadministrative elements.

   Factor 7: The more positive the score, the more an individual appears willing to attribute the problems to external, non-personal elements and to accept a deterministic attitude toward the situation.

5. Correlations Tables:

   In order to determine the relationship between responses to various pairs of items (as well as between items and factor scores), Pearson product moment correlation coefficients (r) were calculated. Values of r theoretically range from +1.00 to -1.00. In Tables 14 and 18, only values of r which are significantly different from zero at the .05 level of confidence are reported. In other words, relationships revealed are due to chance fewer than five times in 100 observations. Positive values of r imply that as scores on one item increase, scores on the correlated item increase also whereas a negative r indicates that as scores on one item increase, scores on the second item decrease.

6. For Statistical Comparisons (t and F):
   Comparative statements are based on 2-tailed tests of significance. Values of t and F are considered significant when the associated probability level is less than or equal to .10. In other words, comparative statements are based on reflected differences between (among) group means which are not to be attributed to chance. Such differences would occur by chance fewer than 10 times in 100 observations.

7. A number of the tables which are included in this appendix are set up in terms of item numbers as opposed to item content. A copy of the questionnaire is included in the appendix. The reader must refer to this in order to interpret given tables.

I

Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 3
Rate of Response to the High School Disruption Questionnaire by Regions*

Region	Headquarters and States	Number of Questionnaires Mailed	Number Returned	Response Rate (per cent)
1	Boston	110	30	25
	Connecticut	26	9	35
	Maine	2	1	50
	Massachusetts	48	14	29
	New Hampshire	3	3	100
	Rhode Island	11	3	27
	Vermont	0		
2	New York City	173	43	25
	New Jersey	37	13	35
	New York	136	30	22
3	Philadelphia	290	110	37
	Delaware	8	7	87
	Kentucky	25	7	28
	Maryland	36	15	42
	North Carolina	45	10	22
	Pennsylvania	90	33	37
	Virginia	64	26	41
	West Virginia	10	5	50
	D. C.	14	5	36
4	Atlanta	267	102	38
	Alabama	35	6	17
	Florida	76	29	37
	Georgia	56	30	54
	Mississippi	19	9	47
	South Carolina	14	8	57
	Tennessee	67	20	32
5	Chicago	456	178	39
	Illinois	110	35	32
	Indiana	62	36	58
	Michigan	81	28	35
	Minnesota	34	14	41
	Ohio	131	43	33
	Wisconsin	38	22	58
6	Dallas/Fort Worth	217	58	27
	Arkansas	7	3	43
	Louisiana	44	8	18
	New Mexico	9	3	34
	Oklahoma	22	7	32
	Texas	135	38	28
7	Denver	136	53	38
	Colorado	28	7	25
	Idaho	3	2	67
	Iowa	18	5	28
	Kansas	14	6	43
	Missouri	40	9	43
	Montana	4	4	100
	Nebraska	10	8	80
	North Dakota	2	2	100
	South Dakota	3	2	67
	Utah	12	7	58
	Wyoming	2	0	0
8	San Francisco	313	109	35
	Alaska	3	2	67
	Arizona	25	10	41
	California	228	69	30
	Hawaii	6	3	50
	Nevada	7	3	47
	Oregon	15	7	47
	Washington	29	17	59

*Total Response Rate = 35%
(1962 mailed, 683 returned)

Table 4

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the High School Disruption Questionnaire

Characteristic	Total Sample	Regions 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Sex									
Male	96	97	93	95	98	96	97	100	97
Female	2	0	5	5	1	2	0	0	1
Ethnic Origin									
Black	9	0	5	13	24	5	16	4	3
White	88	97	95	85	75	92	83	94	91
Other	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	2	5
Age									
Less than 30	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
30 - 35	7	3	5	14	5	6	5	8	6
36 - 40	12	3	14	9	11	14	17	11	13
41 - 50	41	20	42	42	42	42	33	34	50
Over 50	38	67	37	35	41	36	40	43	29
Years of Experience									
Less than 1	4	3	2	3	6	3	3	2	4
1 - 2	13	0	23	18	9	12	9	6	16
3 - 5	21	10	19	21	24	18	22	19	27
6 - 10	24	33	30	25	28	26	21	23	20
More than 10	38	50	26	31	43	39	43	51	31
Size of City									
Less than 50,000	10	3	26	16	5	13	2	2	13
50,000 - 99,999	28	57	37	21	20	31	14	34	28
100,000 - 299,999	29	30	19	28	32	25	26	42	30
300,000 - 699,999	20	10	12	16	26	15	38	21	19
700,000 - 1,500,000	7	0	0	10	14	6	16	2	5
More than 1,500,000	6	0	7	8	3	10	5	0	5
School Enrollment									
Less than 500	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	0
500 - 999	8	7	0	13	12	6	9	9	7
1000 - 1999	54	63	70	56	60	51	45	55	46
2000 - 3000	31	23	23	25	24	31	43	32	41
More than 3000	5	7	7	5	4	10	2	0	5
Size of Staff									
Less than 25	2	0	0	3	0	2	2	2	3
25 - 49	5	0	0	5	10	4	7	2	6
50 - 99	51	27	44	47	64	48	59	55	56
100 - 249	35	67	42	38	24	34	29	42	30
150 - 200	5	3	12	4	3	6	3	0	6
More than 200	2	3	2	3	0	5	0	0	0

Table 5
A Comparison of the Ethnicity of School Staffs and Student Bodies

	Per Cent Less than 5%		Per Cent 6%-25%		Per Cent 26%-49%		Per Cent 50%-90%		Per Cent 91%-100%	
	Student	Staff	Student	Staff	Student	Staff	Student	Staff	Student	Staff
Black	51	60	28	25	7	6	4	5	9	2
White	9	2	3	4	5	4	35	30	48	60
Spanish-Speaking	79	88	12	5	3	1	1	0	0	0
Oriental	93	91	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	93	91	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 6

A Regional Comparison of the Ethnicity of School Staffs and Student Bodies

		Percentages									
Ethnic		less than 5%		6-25%		26-49%		50-90%		91-100%	
Group	Region	Staff	Student	Staff	Student	Staff	Student	Staff	Student	Staff	Student
Black	1	87	73	7	17	0	7	0	3	0	0
	2	74	40	26	37	0	14	0	5	0	5
	3	46	41	37	33	7	6	5	10	2	9
	4	10	25	49	32	17	15	18	2	6	26
	5	66	49	25	33	3	6	3	4	2	7
	6	53	57	19	19	16	5	5	3	5	16
	7	87	74	6	15	2	4	4	2	0	4
	8	86	70	10	23	2	4	0	2	0	1
White	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	7	27	93	70
	2	0	7	0	0	0	5	23	42	77	47
	3	1	8	5	5	4	5	35	33	55	46
	4	6	22	9	2	11	2	59	39	14	30
	5	1	6	2	2	4	5	23	34	70	52
	6	5	16	7	3	5	9	43	29	40	41
	7	2	6	4	2	0	4	11	21	83	68
	8	1	4	1	4	3	5	19	42	75	46
Spanish-Speaking	1	90	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	91	79	5	12	0	2	0	2	0	0
	3	88	90	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	1
	4	86	85	6	6	0	2	0	0	0	0
	5	93	89	2	7	0	2	0	0	1	0
	6	67	59	19	17	7	9	0	7	0	3
	7	92	79	2	13	2	6	0	0	0	0
	8	87	53	11	37	0	6	0	2	0	0
Other	1	87	90	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	93	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	3	88	92	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
	4	91	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	5	93	96	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	6	86	93	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	7	94	98	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	8	92	86	3	10	1	2	2	1	0	0

Table 7
Black Student Enrollment in Schools Which Have Predominantly Black Staffs*

% Black Students	frequency	%
Less than 5%	4	8
6 - 25%	3	6
26 - 49%	1	2
50 - 90%	2	4
More than 90%	39	80

* Staff is at least 50% black (N = 49). Only 14 responses were from schools which had staffs which were more than 90% black. Of the 14, student bodies at 4 were less than 26% black while those at 9 were greater than 90% black (student enrollment was not designated at the remaining school).

II

Summaries of Reported Disruption in Terms of Various Subgroups

Table 8
Explanation
A Summary of Disruption in Terms of the Ethnic Compatibility of Student Body and Staff

Statistical tests reveal that the differences reflected among the three categories are significant. Disruption is most apt to occur in those schools in which the percentage of black students in the school exceeds the percentage of black staff members. Disruption takes on a more racial tone in those schools also. Differences between categories 2 and 3 do not appear to be significant. To the degree that black representation within the student body is equal to or less than black representation on the staff, disruption is minimized and that disruption which does in fact occur appears to have little racial basis.

Table 8
A Summary of Disruption in Terms of the Ethnic Compatibility of Student Body and Staff

	Category 1 Percentage Black Students greater than percentage Black Staff ($\underline{N}$ = 214)				Category 2 Percentage Black Students and Staff equal ($\underline{N}$ = 404)				Category 3 Percentage Black Students less than percentage Black Staff ($\underline{N}$ = 55)			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
Teacher boycott, walkout or strike	67	28	3	0	81	18	0	0	84	16	0	0
Student boycott, walkout or strike	49	11	15	24	74	14	5	6	82	5	9	2
Arson	67	22	7	2	83	13	1	2	84	13	0	0
Property Damage (not arson)	34	47	12	5	46	49	3	2	56	40	2	0
Rioting	74	3	8	12	94	1	1	4	98	0	0	0
Student-Teacher physical confrontation	56	19	19	6	76	16	6	2	75	11	11	2
Picketing or Parading	60	17	9	12	80	15	2	2	82	9	4	4
Presence of Unruly Nonstudents	29	30	23	16	51	33	10	5	65	22	9	2
Abnormal Student Unruliness	47	14	25	12	74	12	9	4	73	11	15	0

a = did not occur b = occurred, no racial basis c = occurred, somewhat racial basis d = occurred, substantial racial basis

Table 9
A Profile of Disruption in Terms of Ethnicity of Staff

	Staff over 50% Black (N=49)				Staff over 50% White (N=613)			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
Teacher boycott, walkout, or strike	86	12	2	0	76	22	1	0
Student boycott, walkout, or strike	57	24	10	8	67	11	9	12
Arson	69	24	4	0	79	15	2	2
Property Damage (Not Arson)	41	51	6	2	43	47	6	3
Rioting	88	6	4	2	88	1	3	7
Student-Teacher Physical Confrontation	61	22	14	2	70	16	10	3
Picketing or Parading	69	20	6	4	75	14	4	6
Presence on campus of unruly non-students	37	43	12	8	46	31	14	8
Abnormal student unruliness	57	27	16	0	66	12	14	7

a = did not occur
b = no racial basis
c = somewhat racial basis
d = substantial racial basis

Table 10

Percent of Schools with Over 90% Black Enrollment which Reported No Disruption

	% of Black on Staff				
	less than 5% (N=3)	6-25% (N=8)	26-49% (N=12)	50-90% (N=29)	More than 90% (N=10)
Teacher boycott, walkout or strike	100	37	50	83	90
Student boycott, walkout or strike	100	62	42	52	50
Arson	100	87	42	69	60
Property Damage (not arson)	100	25	8	31	60
Rioting	100	100	83	79	100
Student-Teacher physical confrontation	67	37	33	52	90
Picketing or Parading	100	50	58	62	70
Presence of Unruly Nonstudents	33	25	25	24	40
Abnormal Student Unruliness	100	50	50	48	70

Disruption which occurred in schools having less than 5% black staff and those having more than 90% black staff had no racial basis (with the exception of disruption attributed to the presence of nonstudents on campus).

Table 11

A Profile of Disruption Based on Size of Student Body

	Enrollment less than 1000 (N = 68)				Enrollment 1000-1999 (N = 367)				Enrollment greater than 2000 (N = 248)			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
Teacher boycott, walkout, or strike	81	16	0	0	81	17	1	0	70	27	2	0
Student boycott, walkout or strike	74	12	4	7	69	12	8	10	61	14	10	14
Arson	85	7	3	1	80	15	2	2	73	19	4	2
Property Damage (not arson)	47	43	4	3	43	48	5	3	42	48	7	3
Rioting	88	3	0	4	90	1	3	5	84	2	4	9
Student-Teacher physical confrontation	69	16	10	1	71	16	9	3	66	17	12	4
Picketing or Parading	74	10	7	6	76	14	4	4	71	18	3	7
Presence of unruly nonstudents	57	22	9	9	47	31	13	8	39	36	16	8
Abnormal student unruliness	69	9	9	7	67	14	13	5	62	12	17	8

Table 12

A Profile of Disruption in Terms of Black Student Enrollment

	less than 5% Black				6-25% Black				Over 50% Black			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
Teacher boycott, walkout or strike	83	16	0	0	74	24	1	0	66	29	2	1
Student boycott, walkout or strike	82	13	3	1	52	7	16	25	49	23	13	12
Arson	85	13	0	0	75	16	4	3	65	24	6	1
Property Damage (not arson)	48	49	1	1	39	43	11	6	31	54	10	2
Rioting	97	1	0	1	79	2	5	14	78	3	9	5
Student-Teacher physical confrontation	80	15	3	1	63	15	15	7	48	20	27	2
Picketing or Parading	83	15	1	0	68	13	6	11	57	23	12	6
Presence of unruly nonstudents	57	35	5	1	35	26	23	15	24	40	22	12
Abnormal student unruliness	81	13	4	1	52	7	27	14	47	25	20	4

a = did not occur   b = no racial basis   c = somewhat racial basis
d = substantial racial basis

Table 13

A Profile of Disruption in Terms of Principals' Experience

	less than 2 years (N=110)				3-5 years (N=142)				6-10 years (N=161)				more than 10 years (N=260)			
	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d	a	b	c	d
Teacher boycott, walkout or strike	70	25	2	1	79	18	1	0	78	20	1	0	78	21	1	0
Student boycott, walkout or strike	60	11	15	14	63	12	11	13	71	14	7	9	68	13	6	11
Arson	76	16	4	2	77	18	4	1	80	17	2	2	80	14	2	2
Property Damage (not arson)	34	52	10	4	44	49	5	1	39	52	4	5	49	42	5	2
Rioting	84	3	5	8	86	1	4	6	88	2	4	6	90	1	2	5
Student-Teacher physical confrontation	58	21	16	5	68	18	10	2	70	17	10	3	74	13	8	3
Picketing or Parading	74	15	5	6	71	14	7	5	73	19	2	5	76	13	3	5
Presence of unruly nonstudents	43	30	19	8	50	26	11	10	36	39	19	6	49	32	10	8
Abnormal unruliness among students	55	11	24	10	65	13	11	7	67	13	14	6	68	13	12	5

III

Relatedness of Disruption and Specific Survey Items

Table 14
Explanation

Correlations between Various Forms of Disruption and Other Specific Items

1. Items 1 and 2: Size of student body appears to be a more important variable than does size of city.

2. Items 3, 4, and 5: The racial basis of disruption is positively related to the percentage of black students (and staff -- item 9) and negatively related to the percentage of white students (and staff -- item 10). The relationship between student-staff ethnic compatibility and disruption is best illustrated in Table 8.

3. Items 23 - 31: The racial basis of disruption contributes to increased racial tension.

4. Items 8 and 57 again reflect the importance of size of school (as does item 2). Larger schools have more problems.

5. Item 58: As average daily attendance goes down, disruption increases or vice versa.

6. Item 76: Disruption is positively related to the percentage of students who work part-time.

Table 14

Correlations between Various Forms of Disruption and Other Specific Items (N=683)

Item No.	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1	18						11	06	
2	13	13	11		12	08		10	11
3	15	25	18	15	17	24	22	28	24
4	-15	-19	-18	-10	-12	-20	-16	-19	-15
5		11							
8	15	13	12	09	15	14	12	15	15
9		11	09			14	09	11	12
10		-10				-11		-09	-11
11									
23	68	18	13	12	19	11	21	15	10
24	18	80	28	32	40	30	54	41	53
25	11	25	69	39	21	29	28	29	26
26	13	25	32	71	33	40	35	46	40
27	17	31	30	34	82	32	32	42	44
28	10	31	26	37	28	82	28	38	48
29	21	45	28	35	35	29	82	43	43
30	15	33	29	44	40	44	38	77	55
31	10	45	27	39	46	47	42	54	82
57	14	16	14	10		15	09	13	15
58	14	14	12	11	15	18	14	16	13
70									09
71		16	09			11	14	18	19
72	14	14		11	12		15	14	16
76	12		10	13	15	11	10	14	10
77	09								
104				-08		-09			-11
105									
106									

Note: the decimal which precedes the number has been omitted

IV

Strategies for Coping with Disruption

Table 15

Strategies for Coping with Disruption: A Regional Comparison

	% in each region who responded "YES"								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Do you have school - paid community liaison people on your staff?	13	30	26	12	28	24	45	27	26
Do you have an established, standing crisis group at your school?	23	23	25	32	30	26	30	35	29
Does your district have a staff tactical group to handle trouble?	27	21	36	49	43	33	36	50	40
Do you use T-groups in working with students/staff?	27	30	26	26	21	17	23	25	24
Do you have discretionary dollars which enable you to respond to disruption?	13	21	18	18	21	26	30	19	20
Is your discretionary authority adequate to respond to trouble?	97	74	74	71	81	84	87	88	82
Is there a policy of minimal response to the press?	57	42	45	49	51	45	47	44	48
Have school boundaries been altered to control disruptive social mixes?	3	9	9	7	8	5	9	8	8
Are school doors locked during school hours?	27	40	12	5	21	2	11	5	14
Has it been necessary to frisk or search students?	7	30	17	33	25	31	25	40	27
Has it been necessary to search lockers?	53	60	58	47	63	50	62	71	59
Are uniformed policemen regularly used in school buildings?	0	9	6	1	14	2	0	2	6
Are nonuniformed policemen regularly used in school buildings?	0	14	7	0	16	0	9	5	8

V

Comparisons of Various Propositions and the Relationships between Derived Factors and Specific Items

Table 16

The Average Response to Each of 25 Propositions Relative to High School Disruption (N = 683)

Mean Response*	Item No.	Proposition
3.23	78.	When disruption occurs, the process and style one uses to respond to it is less important than the substance of one's response.
1.64	79.	There should be more in-service training about conflict management for topside school administrators.
2.10	80.	Teacher recruitment and criteria for selection should be wider and more varied.
2.06	81.	There should be some kind of "community advocate" system to better relate a community to its school.
3.28	82.	When disruption occurs, it is often wiser to just "ride it out" rather than get into anxious negotiations and meetings.
3.12	83.	Administrators should not encourage ethnic programs and groups such as Black Studies or the Chicano Student Association.
3.08	84.	Schools in low-income settings should have younger teachers and staff members.
1.91	85.	Press coverage of school trouble is rarely helpful.
4.03	86.	Students who work full or part-time are more likely to engage in disruptive activity than those who do not work.
2.27	87.	A regular "rap session" between students and principal (once or twice a week) is helpful in reducing the chances of disruption.
3.13	88.	There can be too much dialogue between students and principal; sometimes it is better not to talk.
2.30	89.	All things being relatively equal, it is a wise policy to promote or recruit a black teacher/administrator before a white one in a predominantly black school.
3.05	90.	Vista Volunteers and Teacher Corps type personnel, used on a regular basis, help keep the permanent faculty "up to date" and responsive.
2.38	91.	When districts bus significant numbers of students, in whatever direction and however far or near, this often creates racial, ethnic, or income differences which produce disruption.
2.64	92.	The mere presence of uniformed police inside a school building is often a cause rather than a deterent of school disruption.

3

Mean Response	Item No.	Proposition
1.85	93.	Continuing college disruption and the great publicity about it is a major cause of high school disruption.
2.23	94.	Pressure on students from various political outsiders is a major cause of disruption in city schools.
2.67	95.	"Underground" student newspapers or flyers are significant causes of school disruption.
2.82	96.	Teacher unions or associations often resist school changes which could reduce disruptions.
1.75	97.	Whatever the noise created by a minority of restless students, a school typically has a substantial majority which is loyal to the school and will not disrupt it.
3.51	98.	A major cause of student unrest is frustration caused by hasty career and program guidance counseling.
2.68	99.	Significant numbers of classroom teachers are no longer effective with the kinds of students now enrolled in our high schools.
2.13	100.	A school is essentially a receptacle for a large number of difficult societal conflicts it has not created.
2.24	101.	There is a good deal of pessimism, even numbness, among teachers with respect to the notion that city schools will ever be really free from disruption in the next decade.
2.76	102.	I, as a principal, share the above pessimism. (I do not think city schools will be really free from disruption during the next decade.)

Table 17

Division of the 25 Propositions of the High School Disruption Questionnaire into Common Factors

Factor 1 - Active-Passive Administrative Response to Disruption

When disruption occurs, it is often wiser to just "ride it out rather than get into anxious negotiations and meetings.

Administrators should not encourage ethnic programs and groups such as Black Studies or the Chicano Student Association.

Press coverage of school trouble is rarely helpful.

There can be too much dialogue between principal and students: sometimes it is better not to talk.

Factor 2 - Concern for Preventive Programs

There should be more in-service training about conflict management for topside school administrators.

Teacher recruitment and criteria for selection should be wider and more varied.

There should be some kind of "community advocate" system to better relate a community to its school.

Factor 3 - Pessimism

I, as a principal share the above pessimism (I do not think city school will be really free from disruption during the next decade).

There is a good deal of pessimism, even numbness, among teachers with respect to the notion that city schools will ever be really free from disruption in the next decade.

A school is essentially a receptacle for a large number of difficult social conflicts it has not created.

Factor 4 - Blame: Internal, Nonadministrative

Significant numbers of classroom teachers are no longer effective with the kinds of students now enrolled in our high schools.

Teacher unions or associations often resist school changes which could reduce disruptions.

A major cause of student unrest is frustration caused by hasty career and program guidance counseling.

The mere presence of uniformed police inside a school building is often a cause rather than a deterent of school disruption.

Factor 5 - Social Desirability

All things being relatively equal, it is a wise policy to promote or recruit a black teacher/administrator before a white one in a predominantly black school.

A regular "rap session" between students and principal is helpful in reducing the chances of disruption.

Vista Volunteers and Teacher Corps type personnel, used on a regular basis, help keep the permanent faculty "up to date" and responsive.

There can be too much dialogue between principal and students; sometimes it is better not to talk. (-)

Factor 6 - Blame: External, Nonadministrative

Pressure on students from various political outsiders is a major cause of disruption in city schools.

Continuing college disruption and the great publicity about it is a major cause of high school disruption.

"Underground" student newspapers or flyers are significant causes of school disruption.

Factor 7 - External Causation, Determinism

There is a good deal of pessimism, even numbness, among teachers with respect to the notion that city schools will ever be really free from disruption in the next decade.

I, as a principal, share the above pessimism (I do not think city schools will be really free from disruption during the next decade).

Significant numbers of classroom teachers are no longer effective with kinds of students now enrolled in our high schools.

A school is essentially a receptacle for a large number of difficult societal conflicts it has not created.

"Underground" student newspapers or flyers are significant causes of school disruption.

Continuing college disruption and the great publicity about it is a major cause of high school disruption.

Teacher unions or associations often resist school changes which could reduce disruptions.

A major cause of student unrest is frustration caused by hasty career and program guidance counseling.

Pressure on students from various political outsiders is a major cause of disruption in city schools.

Table 18
Explanation

Correlations between the Seven Derived Factors and Specific Disruption Items
($\underline{N}$ = 683)

1. Factor 1 (Active-Passive Administrative Response to Disruption) is most consistently related to disruption (items 14-22). Less passive response is associated with the occurrence of disruptions. This is also true for those disruptions which have a specific racial basis.

   There appears to be a relationship between the ethnic composition of staff and the principal's response to the propositions concerning disruption. As the percentage of black staff increases, principals tend to report:

   a. a more active response to disruption;
   b. more concern for preventive training programs; and
   c. fewer socially desirable responses.

   Conversely, as the percentage of white staff increases, principals tend to report:

   a. a more passive response to disruption;
   b. less concern for preventive training programs; and
   c. more socially desirable responses.

2. Again, the size of the school is to be noted as an index of disruption (items 2, 8, 57). Larger schools appear to report more frequent disruptions.

Table 18

Correlations between the Seven Derived Factors and Specific Disruption Items (N=683)

Item No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1							
2	16	09					11
3	17	-18			10		
4	-15	19			-09		
5			-12			11	
6							
7							
8	12						
9	08	-12			09		
10	-09	11			-09		
11						10	
12							
13							
14	09	-08					
15	13						
16	08						
17			08				
18	10		08				
19	10	-10	11				
20	10						
21	11		09	09			
22	11	-08	12				-10
57	15					-08	
58	13			08			
70	10		-13				12
104	-08	11				10	
105							
106	-10						

Note: the decimal which precedes the number has been omitted

VI

Comparisons of Factor and Item Responses across Various Subgroups

Table 19

A Comparison of Selected Responses of Principals Grouped by Geographic Regions

Group 1 = Boston (N=30)
Group 2 = New York City (N=43)
Group 3 = Philadelphia (N=110)
Group 4 = Atlanta (N=102)
Group 5 = Chicago (N=178)
Group 6 = Dallas/Ft. Worth (N=58)
Group 7 = Denver (N=53)
Group 8 = San Francisco (N=109)

Variable	Comparative Observations
Size of City	Region 6 responses represent largest cities while those of Region 1 represent the smallest.
Size of Student Body	Largest schools are in Region 8; smallest, in Region 7.
% Black Students	Region 4 reported the greatest percentage of black students; Region 8, the least.
% White Students	Region 1 reported the greatest percentage of white students; Region 4, the least.
Size of Staff	Region 1 reported the largest staff size; Region 4, the smallest.
% Black Staff	Region 4 reported the largest percentage of black staff; Region 1, the smallest.
% White Staff	Region 1 reported the largest percentage of white staff; Region 4, the smallest.
Items 78-102	Principals in Region 2 are least accepting of a position of passive response while those in Region 7 are most accepting of a position of passive response. Principals in Region 8 are most concerned about preventive training programs while those in Region 1 are least concerned about preventive training programs. Principals in Region 7 are most likely to blame disrupon internal, nonadministrative elements while those in Region 6 are least likely to blame disruption on internal, nonadministrative elements. Principals of Region 3 are least prone to endorse socially acceptable statements while those in Region 7 are most prone to endorse socially acceptable statements. Principals of Region 6 are most likely to blame disruption on external, nonadministrative elements while those in Region 1 are least likely to blame disruption on external, nonadministrative elements.

Table 20

A Comparison of Selected Responses of Principals Who Reported Some Form of Disruption (N = 577) and Those Who Reported No Disruption (N = 106)

Variable	Comparative Result Based on *t* test*
Size of City	No difference (both average 100,000-299,999)
Size of student body	Schools which report disruption have larger enrollment.
% Black students	Schools which report disruption average 6-25% black enrollment, those which report no disruption average less than 5%.
% White students	Schools which report disruption average 50-90% white, those which report no disruption average greater than 90% white.
Size of staff	Schools which report disruption have larger staff.
% Black staff	No difference (both average less than 5%)
% White staff	No difference
items 78-102	No differences were evidenced on any of the 7 factors derived from these items. Average responses of both groups were essentially the same.

Table 21

Comparison of Responses of the Black Principals (N=63) and the White Principals (N=602)*

	Black Principals				
	% Selecting Each Alternative				
Item	a	b	c	d	e
1	16	33	25	10	10
2	2	13	68	13	3
3	3	8	3	14	70
4	63	3	11	8	5
8	8	62	22	2	3
9	8	21	16	37	16
10	14	30	16	25	10
15	49	30	11	6	
16	68	25	3	0	
17	37	52	5	3	
19	54	22	21	2	
20	56	27	11	5	
21	35	38	13	11	
22	56	25	11	6	
24	62	27	5	2	
25	70	22	2	2	
26	41	41	11	2	
28	54	29	11	2	
29	54	32	6	3	
30	41	38	11	5	
31	52	27	11	5	
32	29	0	71	0	
34	27	2	10	60	
38	40	59			
39	68	32			
44	46	54			
45	33	67			
46	51	49			
47	17	70			
52	19	79			
53	30	70			
55	41	59			
56	52	48			
57	46	46			
58	43	41	14	2	0
59	46	54			
62	60	40			
64	59	41			

	White Principals				
	% Selecting Each Alternative				
Item	a	b	c	d	e
1	29	29	18	7	5
2	1	7	53	33	6
3	56	30	7	3	3
4	3	2	4	37	53
8	5	51	36	5	2
9	65	25	5	2	1
10	1	1	3	30	66
15	68	11	8	11	
16	79	15	2	1	
17	44	47	6	3	
19	71	16	9	3	
20	76	14	3	5	
21	46	31	14	8	
22	66	12	15	6	
24	71	15	8	3	
25	81	14	3	0	
26	54	36	7	1	
28	72	17	7	1	
29	78	13	5	2	
30	54	26	15	3	
31	66	14	15	3	
32	16	5	79	0	
34	15	1	7	74	
38	49	51			
39	56	43			
44	39	60			
45	23	76			
46	27	73			
47	30	65			
52	10	90			
53	21	78			
55	26	73			
56	60	40			
57	20	65			
58	68	28	3	0	0
59	23	77			
62	50	50			
64	66	33			
65	82	17			

	Black Principals				
	% Selecting Each Alternative				
Item	a	b	c	d	e
65	73	27			
66	57	43			
67	46	14	13	27	
69	11	86			
71	14	41	38		
72	24	25	48		
75	62	38			
76	33	48	16	3	0
77	75	17	3	2	0
104	6	21	24	10	38
106	0	8	17	32	43

	White Principals				
	% Selecting Each Alternative				
Item	a	b	c	d	e
65	82	17			
66	46	53			
67	55	19	16	9	
69	7	91			
71	16	51	25		
72	20	37	42		
75	47	53			
76	23	52	21	3	0
77	82	12	3	1	0
104	3	12	20	25	39
106	0	7	11	42	38

Table 22
A Comparison of Selected Responses of Black (N=63) and White (N=602) Principals

Variable	Comparative Observations
Size of City	Black respondents were from larger cities than white respondents (average population).
Size of Student Body	White principals reported a larger student enrollment than did black principals.
% Black Students	Student bodies led by black administrators averaged greater than 50% black while those led by white administrators averaged less than 25% black.
% White Students	Black principals report lower white student enrollment.
Size of Staff	White principals report a larger average staff size.
% Black Staff	Black principals report a greater percentage of black staff than do white principals.
% White Staff	White principals report a larger percentage of white staff.
Items 78 - 102	Black principals endorse a more active response to disruption (Factor 1) and a greater concern for preventive training programs (Factor 2). No differences are reported for factors 3 - 7.

Table 23
A Comparison of Selected Responses of Principals Grouped in Terms of Reported Average Daily Attendance

Group 1 ADA = 90 - 100% (N=445)
Group 2 ADA = 80 - 89% (N=200)
Group 3 ADA = 0 - 79% (N= 35)

Variable	Comparative Observations
Size of City	Group 3 schools are in cities which average 300,000 - 699,999 while those in Groups 1 and 2 are in cities which average 100,000 - 299,999.
Size of Student Body	No difference
% Black Students	Group 3 schools average 50-90% black while Group 1 and 2 schools average 6-25% black.
% White Students	Group 3 schools average 6-25% white while Group 1 and 2 schools average 50-90% white.
Size of Staff	No difference
% Black Staff	Group 3 schools average 26-47% black while Group 1 schools average less than 5% black and Group 1 schools average 6-25% black.
% White Staff	Group 1 schools average more than 90% white while Group 2 and 3 schools average 50-90% white.
Items 78 - 102	Group 3 school principals support propositions which characterize them as being: 1. less prone to a passive response to disruption (Factor 1); 2. more concerned about preventive training programs (Factor 2); and 3. more prone to place the blame for disruption on internal, nonadministrative elements (Factor 4). In all instances, Group 3 principals' responses were the most different from the responses of Group 1 principals.

Table 24
A Comparison of Selected Responses of Principals Grouped in Terms of Reported Access to Information Relative to Disruption

Group 1 = Inadequate access (N = 35)
Group 2 = Good or fair access (N =514)
Group 3 = Excellent access (N =128)

Variable	Comparative Observations
Size of City	No difference
Size of Student Body	Size of student body is linearly related to access to information. Group 3 principals are from largest schools.
% Black Students	No difference
% White Students	No difference
Size of Staff	No difference
% Black Staff	No difference
% White Staff	No difference
Items 78 - 102	Group 3 principals average responses to these items indicate that they are most active in responding to disruption (Factor 1), most concerned about preventive training programs (Factor 2), and least pessimistic (Factor 3).

Table 25

Observations Relative to Years of Experience*

Principals who have less experience:

1. Report greater black enrollment.
2. Endorse a more active response to disruption.
3. Report greater concern for preventive training programs.
4. Are more hesitant to project blame for disruption onto external elements (non-school).

---

*Frequency of Experience

Group 1 = less than 2 years experience (_N_=110)

Group 2 = 3-5 years (_N_=142)

Group 3 = 6-10 years (_N_=161)

Group 4 = 10 years (_N_=260)

Table 26

Observations of Schools which Use Uniformed Police on a Regular Basis

---

Schools in which uniformed police are found regularly (N=40) are most apt to:

1. Be in larger cities (greater than 100,000)
2. Have larger student bodies (greater than 2000)
3. Have more black students (greater than 25%)
4. Have fewer white students (less than 26%)
5. Have larger staffs (over 100)
6. Have more black staff members (6-25%)
7. Have fewer white staff members (50-90%)

Principals of schools in which uniformed police are regularly on duty are most apt to :

1. Respond actively to disruption (Factor 1)
2. Be more concerned about preventive training programs (Factor 2)
3. Be less prone to acquiescence (Factor 5)

VII

A Summary of All Responses

Table 27

A Summary of Responses to All Items: Total Sample (N = 683)

	% Selecting Each Alternative						% Selecting Each Alternative				
item	a	b	c	d	e	item	a	b	c	d	e
1	28	29	20	7	6	45	24	75			
2	1	8	54	31	5	46	29	70			
3	51	28	7	4	9	47	28	66	6		
4	9	3	5	35	48	48	36	56	8		
5	7	12	3	1	0	49	11	88			
6	93	2	0	0	0	50	6	93			
7	93	1	0	0	0	51	1	98			
8	5	52	35	5	2	52	11	88			
9	60	25	6	5	2	53	22	77			
10	2	4	4	30	60	54	14	86			
11	88	5	1	0	0	55	27	72			
12	91	1	0	0	0	56	59	40			
13	91	0	0	0	0	57	23	63	11		
14	77	21	1	0		58	65	29	4		
15	66	13	9	11		59	26	77			
16	78	16	3	2		60	19	80			
17	43	47	6	3		61	18	82			
18	88	2	3	6		62	51	48			
19	69	16	10	3		63	90	10			
20	74	15	4	6		64	65	34			
21	45	32	14	8		65	81	18			
22	65	13	14	6		66	47	52			
23	78	18	1	0		67	54	18	16	11	
24	70	16	8	3		68	8	91			
25	79	15	3	0		69	8	90			
26	53	36	7	1		70	5	26	49	18	
27	85	5	4	2		71	16	50	27		
28	70	18	8	1		72	20	36	42		
29	76	15	5	2		73	20	78			
30	53	27	14	3		74	82	17			
31	65	15	14	3		75	48	52			
32	17	5	78	0		76	24	51	21	3	0
33	7	0	0	89		77	81	13	3	1	0
34	16	1	8	72		78	13	22	10	37	18
35	0	0	0	95		79	47	42	8	2	0
36	87	12				80	29	39	23	8	1
37	82	11				81	26	47	20	6	1
38	48	52				82	5	21	24	35	14
39	57	42				83	11	16	27	32	12
40	86	14				84	6	17	41	29	6
41	26	73				85	42	36	9	9	3
42	94	5				86	2	4	11	47	34
43	85	15				87	18	47	21	10	2
44	40	59				88	5	31	17	35	11

Table 27

A Summary of Responses to All Items: Total Sample (N = 683) (continued)

	% Selecting Each Alternative				
item	a	b	c	d	e
89	17	46	25	8	3
90	2	16	55	17	7
91	17	39	30	11	2
92	12	35	30	17	5
93	34	50	10	4	1
94	20	47	20	10	1
95	10	35	31	22	2
96	7	30	32	26	3
97	39	50	6	4	1
98	1	12	28	46	12
99	8	44	17	26	3
100	26	47	13	11	2
101	14	55	16	11	1
102	11	38	13	29	6
103	9	88	1	0	1
104	4	13	21	24	38
105	96	2			
106	1	7	12	41	38